UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. VII AUTUMN, 1955 No. 3

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
Anglicans at the Crossroads

W. H. VAN DE POL
The Church as the Mystical Body in Calvinistic Protestantism

BERNARD LEIB, S.J.
An Essay on the Psychology of Photius

JOSEPH GILL, S.J.
Relations between Constantinople and Moscow

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
The Holy Father's Letter to the Abbot of Grottaferrata
Address of Pope Pius XII to Historians of World Congress in Rome
A growing Rigidity among the French Reformed? - a Commentary
The Church of England and the Church of South India.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION - AROUND THE WORLD

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia

Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

October 1955

ANGLICANS AT THE CROSSROADS

For some weeks now a part of the Church of England has been deeply troubled. This is because the supreme direction of that Church, Convocations, has recently approved a relationship of intercommunion with the Church of South India, the constitution of which seems to many an Anglican to be in clear-cut contradiction with the essential principles of Anglicanism.

As most of our readers probably know, the Church of South India is a union that came about through an amalgamation of four different denominations: Anglican, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregationalist. This union had first been proposed in 1931 but came into actualization only some sixteen years later, in 1947. Because a constituent part of this new Church is made up of former Anglicans, relations with it were discussed at various times in the assemblies of the Church of England where it was looked upon with growing favour. Finally, in July of this year the decisive step in its regard was taken by Convocations. This newly organized Church is now practically recognized as enjoying intercommunion with the Church of England.

Some explanation is necessary for the reader to grasp the importance of this event. The Anglican Church, first of all, is an *episcopal* Church; that is to say, an important part of its tradition has been the office of bishops as successors of the Apostles to rule over particular churches. These bishops are consecrated by other bishops, and it pertains to them to ordain candidates for the priesthood. This is just as it is in the Catholic Church (although the latter, as we know, does not recognize the validity of Anglican orders). The other denominations, however, which were to join with the Anglicans to form but one Church in South India were not episcopal in character. To cope with this difficulty, the subsequent compromise was eventually agreed upon:

The non-episcopal denominations were to be ruled over by bishops in the future, and their clergy were to receive their ordination from a bishop. At the same time, however, these denominations would be under no obligation whatever to change their beliefs regarding the episcopate or their own manner of conferring ordination on their ministers.

In view of this arrangement, the following situation has arisen:

I. The clergymen of non-episcopal Churches who were active in the ministry at the time of the agreement were not required to submit to a new ordination; indeed, despite the fact that they were not ordained by a bishop, they have been recognized as validly exercising their ministry. It follows, then, that the Anglicans of India (with whom those in England remain in communion) have accepted the position of regarding as valid those ordinations which took place without the intermediation of a bishop. Those Anglicans who do not make their episcopal tradition a doctrinal issue have considered this evolution a

very fortunate one. But because of their conviction that the order and function of a bishop pertains to the essence of Catholic doctrine, the Anglo-Catholics, on the other hand, must look upon this disposition with genuine anxiety. If they accept the decision of their ecclesiastical superiors, then they will of necessity be renouncing their own belief. Doubtless, this stumbling block will be removed when all those clergymen will have passed away who were active in their ministry when the amalgamation took place. But the stumbling block remains still; a state of adultery, for example, could not be excused on the grounds of being something merely temporary.

II. Those ministers who receive either their episcopal consecration or priestly ordination from a bishop are free to consider this consecration or ordination simply as a delegation by their community as is the case in civil affairs. They need not consider either one as a Sacrament or as conferring any sacramental character. On the other hand, those who perform the ceremony of consecration are incapable of conferring upon those whom they consecrate more than the candidates themselves wish to receive. Consequently, it is evident that the consecrations and ordinations received under such circumstances do not have the same significance that they have for episcopal confessions; that is to say, from the Anglican standpoint—or at least from that of the Anglo-Catholics—they are simply invalid. If now we consider the matter from the genuinely Catholic position, such consecrations and ordinations are obviously invalid by reason of a defect in the required intention. Here we have a case where there is neither the intention of conferring nor of receiving a Sacrament. There is present simply an appointment to a practical and administrative order which does not bestow any divine power or authority.

From this state of affairs we may draw still further considerations. When in 1896 Leo XIII declared Anglican ordinations to be invalid in his apostolic constitution *Apostolicae Curae*, he made it clear that one of the principal motivations for such a far-reaching decision was the lack of a sufficient intention in those ordinations. The Church of England, he said, at the time of its first conferring of orders no longer believed in the true nature of the priesthood and of its proper function, the sacrifice of the Mass. When Pope Leo made public his declaration, the Anglican hierarchy voiced its protest. But at the present time, however, it has fully and openly confirmed the judgment pronounced by the Pope of Rome, for it recognizes as valid those ordinations in which every intention of administering and of receiving a Sacrament may be absent; and by so doing, it even makes the pretension of changing nothing essential to its doctrine.

If logic still makes itself felt in the affairs of men, those Anglicans who acknowledge the priesthood to be a Sacrament and the Mass a sacrifice are obliged to admit that the Church of England is professing an heretical doctrine, and that they cannot continue to count them-

selves among her members. Their place is rightfully within the Catholic Church. A letter printed last April in the *Tablet* of London and signed by *Pastor Anglicanus* gave a clear exposition of the troubled conscience of Anglo-Catholics with reference to the case in point. In the weeks that followed, his letter evoked still further cries of alarm from other correspondents. If we are to judge from these letters, it seems certain that a group of ministers will abandon Anglicanism because of the present attitude towards the Church of South India. The number will probably not be considerable, however, for—to cite *Pastor Anglicanus* "... the Anglo-Catholic conscience is an elastic that may be stretched to great lengths provided it is stretched gradually." This time, evidently, the pull has been exerted a bit more rapidly.

Whatever may be the outcome of this situation, the duty of Catholics with regard to it seems quite clear. They will pray that the leaders of the Church of England will regain possession of themselves and abandon the way to compromises ruinous of sound doctrine. And they will pray also that those who do not accept this way will receive the strength to follow their consciences. Indeed, they will be ready to receive with fraternal joy and understanding those who come to them.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

THE CHURCH AS THE MYSTICAL BODY IN REFORMED PROTESTANTISM

The principal sources of our knowledge of Reformed Protestant ecclesiology are the writings of Calvin (especially the fourth book of his *Institutio christianae religionis,* in its latter edition of 1559) and also the catechisms, the confessions of faith, and the ecclesiastical ordinances of the different Reformed Churches. All these sources give rather detailed expositions about church-order and ministries, about authority and about the Sacraments of the Church. They speak however with particular reserve about the nature of the Church. Only the first two chapters of the fourth book of the *Institutio* deal with the Church as such. The catechisms and confessions of faith limit themselves to concise definitions, though a rather elaborated explanation is given in the *Confessio Helvetica* of 1566 (Art. XVII).

The term "mystical body" does not figure in these writings. But, besides many other designations, the Church is frequently called "a body" or "the body of Christ". In using this term, Reformed Protestantism keeps close inside the limits of Biblical terminology without letting itself be enticed in the least to speculative conclusions. The Church is called "the body of Christ" in this sense, that the true believers (i.e. those who are inspired by a true personal and living faith or, what comes to the same thing, the "elect of God") are united with Christ Who is the Head of the Church, and therefore, being His members constitute one single body, through their incorporation in Christ. Accordingly we read in Calvin's *Institutio:* "Thus the elect of God are all joined together in Christ in such a manner as to depend on one head and thus to coalesce into one body, united to one another as members of the same body; becoming indeed one thing, and who by one faith, hope, and charity live together by the same Spirit of God, not only called to the same inheritance of eternal life but to a participation (in the life) of the one God and Christ".[1]

It is not sufficient to interpret the term "body" or "body of Christ", which is used by Calvin in his *Institutio* for about twenty times to designate the Church, in a merely figurative sense. The body of Christ is a reality, since it is constituted of members participating in one common life: the life of Christ. It is the Holy Ghost Who produces and preserves this life in the hearts of the believers by two means: through the preaching of the Gospel (the Word of God) and through the ad-

---

[2] Sic electi Dei omnes in Christo sunt connexi, ut quemadmodum ab uno capite pendent, *ita in unum velut corpus* coalescant, ea inter se compage cohaerentes qua eiusdem corporis membra: vere unum facti, qui una fide, spe, charitate, eodem Dei Spiritu simul vivunt, non in eandem modo vitae aeternae hereditatem, sed in unius Dei ac Christi participationem etiam vocati (Inst. 1, IV: c.1, par. 2).

ministration of the two Sacraments instituted by Christ Himself, viz. Holy Baptism and Holy Communion. In both these cases, participation in the life of Christ is objectively speaking the result of an operation of the Holy Spirit, but subjectively speaking it is the effect of a conscious and personal act of living faith on the part of the believer. "Through faith itself the faithful attain to the abiding presence of Christ within them. In this way the Lord, Who has called Himself the Bread of Life, has wished not only to teach us that our salvation derives from His death and resurrection, but indeed that He communicates Himself to us, so that His life passes over into us and becomes our own". [2]

The members of the Church then, constitute together the body of Christ on account of their "Christum in se habentem", and because they are united with Christ by a "vera communicatio".

Now we come to a remarkable feature in Reformed ecclesiology, which it is not easy to understand, or rather which has always been a great problem to the Protestants themselves, as far as concerns the realisation of the body of Christ in the world. We have to do here with the sharp difference which is being made between the Church of the Credo and the Church (or the churches) of our actual experience in the world.

According to Reformed doctrine, the object of faith can never be a thing of experience, never something which can be seen. The divine things and realities are never identical with the visible things on earth (with the only exception of Jesus Christ Himself in His earthly form and substance). Although certain distinctive notes permit us to distinguish between true and false churches, even the true churches are no more than human, and therefore relatively imperfect and provisionary realisations of the invisible church, which is the Church of the Credo, the body of Christ strictly speaking. In all these churches, even in the false ones, true participation in the Body of Christ may be found. On the other hand, unbelievers and hypocrites may be found in all visible churches (even the true ones), and they do not participate in the Body of Christ at all. For this reason too, no element whatever in the life of the visible churches, be it by word, declaration, decision, or any other manifestation, can ever bear an absolute or infallible character; nor does any particular church ever speak or act with absolute authority.

First and foremost the Church of the Credo is the Company of God's elect, i.e. of all true believers who are only known to God. "... to

---

2 Per ipsam (fidem) fideles consequuntur ut Christum in se habeant manentem. In hunc modum voluit Dominus, panem vitae se nuncupando (Joh. 6, 51), non tantum docere in mortis et resurrectionis suae fide repositam esse nobis salutem: sed vera etiam sui communicatione fieri, ut vita sua in nos transeat, ac nostra fiat (Inst. 1, IV, c. 17, par. 5).

God alone is reserved the knowledge of His Church, the foundation of which is His secret election".[3]

This invisible Church, as the company of God's elect, is perfectly identical with the "body of Christ". According to Reformed teaching, Christ has accomplished His work of salvation only for the elect. Only they are called to salvation by the Word of God; only they are capable of a true act of faith, which assures salvation and operates a participation in the body and life of Christ; only the elect receive the gifts of grace offered under the signs of the holy Sacraments in full reality.

The Body of Christ then is strictly speaking an invisible reality. Nevertheless, the visibility of the Body of Christ is not being excluded altogether, in so far as it is spread over the whole earth. Still the Church of the Credo is above all the invisible Church.

On this point a certain hesitation can be noticed in the Reformed confessions. To the question: "What is the meaning of the word catholic or universal?" the *Apostolicum* (the catechism of Geneva published by Calvin in 1542) replies: "It means that, since there is but one Head of the faithful, they must all be united in one body, so that there are not several churches, but only one Church, which is spread over the whole earth".

However, with regard to the visibility of this universal Church, the same catechism adds: "There is indeed the visible Church, to be known by notes which God has given by which to recognize her—but here (in the *Apostolicum*) we have to do with the society of those whom God has elected for salvation, which society we cannot fully behold with our eyes".

The reason why Reformed Protestants are so hesitant to identify the visible Church with the Church of the Credo and the Body of Christ is because the Calvinist Reformation has been above all a resolute condemnation of every tendency to contribute something divine to man or to things created. The same hesitation marks the Reformed teaching on the Sacraments, and their rejection of every thought of man—even in the order of salvation—participating in the nature of God. This is why the Protestant usage of the term "body of Christ" may not be interpreted in an ontological sense.

The tragedy of Reformed Protestantism consists in the tension under which it suffers, between the two fundamental convictions in Reformed theology, which do not seem to admit of reconciliation. On the one hand there is the conviction of every believer being strictly obliged to join the true Church, while separation from the true and visible Church is considered no less than a betrayal of God and Christ (Inst. 1. IV, c. 1, par. 10).

---

[3] ...soli Deo permittenda est cognitio suae Ecclesiae, cuius fundamentum est arcana illius electio (Inst. 1, IV, c. 1, par. 2).

On the other hand, there is the conviction that the true Church is (to be found) only where the Gospel is preached according to the pure truth of Holy Scripture, and the two Sacraments are administered according to the inalterable institution of Christ. Hence, the inevitable consequence that, while the visible Church as the Body of Christ is meant to be the sole guide and rule of faith for all believers, she has at the same time been subjected to the judgment of these very believers, a judgment, which pretends to have no other foundation than Holy Scripture *(sola scriptura)*. The Body of Christ has been spiritualized in such a way that it continually tends to evaporate and consequently to become a practically invisible and impalpable body.

This difficulty in realising the Church of the Credo, the Body of Christ in the world, as a united, indivisible, and incontestable reality of actual experience, is throwing its shadow over all the discussions and manifestations of the World Council of Churches. Here, too, lies the difficulty of integrating traditional names as "Body of Christ" and other names for the Church into the Reformed teaching on the absolute distance between God and men, even man as saved by faith in Jesus Christ.

W. H. VAN DE POL

AN ESSAY ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PHOTIUS

By the very force of his personality, Photius emerges as an outstanding figure of history. Even supposing that he were not known in the West as one of those responsible for the Eastern schism, his name would yet remain as that of a great humanist and statesman. His activities extended to many fields at a time when the West was scarcely able to catch a glimpse of a more promising future, compromised as it was by wars, rivalries, invasions, and disorders of every sort, while Byzantium reflected the first rays of the dawn announcing the renascence of the Macedonian Emperors (857-1057).

The Man and His Environment

Photius had his own part to play in this auspicious awakening. Endowed with unusual talents, an indefatigable worker, a man of taste and of good society, a member of an old family related to that of the Emperor, he was already distinguished by the name and place of his kin. His father, in fact, had been a loyal defender of the cult of images during the wave of iconoclasm, while his uncle Tarasius had become patriarch of Constantinople (704-806) after first serving as president of the imperial chancery. Consequent upon a brilliant course of studies, Photius became prominent as one of the very best professors at the Byzantine University, newly restored in the Magnaura of the palace in 863 by Caesar Bardas, uncle of the Emperor, and administered under the direction of Leo the Philosopher.

Photius at this time is the inspiration of a literary group. For his own part he has read hundreds of works, and he presents critical analyses of them—works of history, of philosophy, of theology, of Sacred Scripture, of hagiography, and of grammar; strangely enough, however, he manifests but little knowledge of poetry. He has made contributions to lexicography, has composed many essays on different subjects, and has produced a copious amount of dogmatic studies, both polemical and juridical, letters, notes, sermons, and scriptural commentaries. All this he has accomplished under the most diverse circumstances—as a celebrated professor and man of the world, as head of a mission for Byzantine propaganda, at the time of his patriarchate, during his exiles, and when he was confined to the palace as the tutor of Leo the Wise.

In all this activity, he keeps his liberty of thought and expression which is serene in character. Despite the press of business, he will remain the perfect master of himself, with but one exception—and the consequences of that will be tragic. It is because he is so well-informed and comprehensive that at a different moment he is promoted from the presidency of the chancery to the patriarchal throne of the Church of Constantinople. His profound knowledge of society and of its ways, of the court with its intrigues, of his day and its conflicting trends—

a consequent of the iconoclastical struggle—and his thorough understanding of the internal and external politics of his time,— all this suggested to his contemporaries in the government to deal with him as they had done previously with his uncle Tarasius and with the latter's successor, namely, to choose as patriarch a high functionary of experience who would be capable of quieting the eventual conflicts in a religious war between the rigorists, who were fierce opponents of any concession, and the liberals, who were less rigid in matters of doctrine because of their proneness towards appeasement.

Caught up in the whirlwind of palace revolutions, Photius was able to weather the changes of fortune and reacted as well as he could according to his possibilities and his competence, always in the interests of Byzantium and with a view towards clearing away the difficulties besetting his nation. He was to see the imperial regent Theodora (842-856) dethroned by her son, the minister Theoktistos liquidated, and the uncle of the new sovereign Caesar Bardas assassinated. He further witnessed the slaying of the Emperor Michael III (842-867) by the very one who owed him his fortune, the future Basil I (867-886). It was Photius's duty as patriarch to prevent further political upsets, and he had to be ready to face exile at each change of regime. He became in time the tutor of the heir to the throne, the son of the very emperor who had deposed him and sent him into exile. Then after remounting his patriarchal throne, he was again constrained to descend and depart into exile.

Was this flexibility and spirit of endurance a mark of real ability or a sign of genuine virtue? We may admit both the one and the other, for Photius is not a Michael Cerularius (1042-1058), the Patriarch of two centuries later who was to exploit for his own ends the weakness of the reign, going so far as to dictate terms to the emperor. This he did in expectation of creating a new ruler himself, who shortly after his elevation was to rid himself of such an importunous tutor by relegating him to one of the Eastern monasteries.

An Election Contested

Let us briefly recall the origin of a drama that continues to prove captivating. The Patriarch Ignatius (846-857 and 867-877), the son of the Emperor Michael I (811-813), was promoted to his office, without any election, by the will of the Empress Theodora alone, and in consequence had been irregularly elevated to the highest dignity in the Byzantine Church as the successor of Methodius (843-846). The latter, exposed to the hostility of the Studite monks who criticized his moderation as weakness, had been constrained to excommunicate these monks and their supporters, in spite of the valor with which the latter had confessed their faith. Ignatius, on whom they now counted and whose rise was due to those desiring an end to religious wrangling, brought these hopes to naught from the very first by bluntly forbidding the

presence of the Bishop of Syracuse, Gregory Asbestas, at his enthronization; for this he was straightway termed an intransigent. It should be stated here that Gregory, a Sicilian like Methodius whose friend he was, would have advised strong measures against the Studites. Ignatius, therefore, wished to give satisfaction to the monks, whom he reintegrated into his communion, by disassociating himself from the hostile prelate. The latter because of this appealed to Rome which sternly demanded an explanation from the Patriarch. From that point on the affair became so protracted that its settlement was still in suspense when Photius (857-867 and 877-886) was elected after the resignation of Ignatius who saw himself involved in a situation that admitted of no solution for himself, for the clergy, and for the government.

Thus the pacification of the Church, longed for by all concerned, appeared to have been realized, thanks to the disinterestedness of Ignatius as well as to the spirit of conciliation on the part of Photius.

But at this turn of events, certain extremists denounced the new Patriarch to Rome because his episcopal consecration had been tarnished by an informality. In fact, one of the consecrating prelates was the same Gregory Asbestas who had been eventually deposed by the Patriarch Ignatius for being obstinate in his views, and whose case was still pending at Rome. Indeed, if the Pope had not ratified the excommuncation, he had nevertheless ruled that as a matter of discipline the bishop abstain from any acts proper to his state. Doubtless, the synod which elected Photius had lifted the penalty; and Photius, to placate the partisans of Gregory, had thought it expedient to have him take his place among the consecrating bishops. By right, however, it pertained to the patriarch alone to lift a censure inflicted by one of his predecessors; now, Photius was obviously not yet a member of the hierarchy; rather the ceremony in question was being performed to bestow that position upon him.

Moreover, it had not been considered that such comportment constituted an act of disobedience towards the Pope to whose tribunal the cause of Gregory had been deferred. In accordance with Roman law, Constantinople had been disqualified to render judgment in a case that now pertained to the Apostolic See. The Church of Constantinople, for reasons of its own, did not share this view of things. Had not Ignatius on the occasion of his accession sent the pallium to the Pope as a gesture of courtesy? The latter, because of this, had been very much offended. Again, a good deal of surprise was occasioned at Byzantium when Nicolas I (858-867) commissioned legates to investigate a matter in which—so it was thought along the Bosporos—he did not have to intervene. However, out of deference an effort was made to comply with an action deemed arbitrary on the part of the Latins, and thus the papal envoys were received with due honor. The latter, as matters turned out, ratified the recent nomination of the Patriarch; but new interventions were made at the papal court by Photius's adversaries who

had been irritated by his return to favor. The Pope, alarmed at the situation, consequently suspended the verdict of his legates who were accused of having been led astray and even of having been bribed. He further demanded the *status quo ante* with the re-establishment of Ignatius in the interim, and summoned the case of Photius to his tribunal.

The Reaction in the East

That which in itself was but an internal crisis at Constantinople developed into a conflict between Rome and Byzantium. There followed an exchange of epistles, quite pointed in tone, in which it would seem that Photius had lost the clarity of vision and the self-control which had distinguished him. He felt that his cause was a just one if one were to judge matters in the light of the customs of the Byzantine Church which the Greeks had derived directly from the twenty-eighth canon of the Council of Chalcedon. To Photius's mind, the Latins were looking for an unpleasant quarrel. And more: he no longer envisioned —and here the psychological element becomes evident—neither the Pope nor Christianity. Instead he compares Byzantium and Rome; he compares himself, a humanist, a high functionary, the imperial Patriarch with the distant Westerner, a prisoner of a barbaric chieftain who has revolted against Constantinople and who has arrogated to himself the title of emperor—something reserved uniquely to the sovereign of the Byzantine Empire. And what is more still, this Westerner is seen only as the ecclesiastical head of the first Rome, a city brought low by invasions and now threatened by the Saracens who are on the point of pillaging it and devastating the Basilica of St. Peter. The barbarian is attacking civilization itself. How could anyone submit to this? Would it not be tantamount to entering a trap? (At this point it is imperative to be quite aware of the Byzantine mentality if one is to comprehend the facts, a mentality that will become progressively inflexible in the centuries that are to follow).

Photius owes it to himself, he concludes, to alert the episcopate of the East against the vagaries of these uncultured Italians who cannot understand; and with a sharp pen he composes an apology which turns into an accusation. He goes to the extent of convoking a synod at Constantinople (867), and losing possession of himself he goes so far as to denounce the Pope before the entire assembly—certainly not qua sovereign pontiff, but as Nicholas, a Latin who was abusing his authority. This vehement outburst he felt would make clear the power and the prestige of Byzantium, the only empire whose political and missionary expansion shown forth in Moravia, Bulgaria, in Russia, as far as the world of the Arabs, the Khazars, the Turks of Vardar, and the khans of Crimea. Was it not bad faith indeed that had raised up an emperor in the West? And is it not the same bad faith that seeks to breach the apostolic expansion of the Greek clergy when the latter

has to contend with the Western clergy, which in the name of the Pope opposes its practices, fights against the use of the vernacular in the liturgy, and sets up barriers to its missionary endeavors? And with what result? Fifty years ago it was believed the Emperor of the West would save Rome. Now the Latins recognize that these dynasties have proved impotent and calculated to sow disorder in an Italy in revolt; and while the Normands' banners fly unfurled over the lands of Charles the Bald, it becomes a matter of urgency to turn once more to the *Basileus* so that his army may protect southern Europe from Moslem domination which is becoming ever more threatening ever since the Crescent has conquered Sicily and has gained a foothold in Southern Italy, with Bari as its center of operation.

Personalities are of little importance here; it is the cause of Byzantium which is at stake, and with it, Christian civilization. Indeed, Photius is now about to be deposed not only by the Pope, but by a new emperor, Basil; and he will submit while Ignatius becomes again the official patriarch (867-877). Nevertheless, both of them, leaving aside their differences, will work together for the civil and religious peace of the empire, so harmoniously indeed that upon the death of the one, the other immediately becomes the patriarch once more, with the accord of both the clergy and the king.

Since there is now a new pope, Photius takes the initiative of renewing relations with him. John VIII (872-882) on his part is equally desirous of this. Once again legates sent from Rome attempt as much as possible to settle the difficulties involved. Each side approaches the problem with all good will; union is sealed between the Pope and the Patriarch to the great satisfaction of all, and it will no longer be disturbed during the lifetime of Photius, as has been historically established.[1]

The Greek clergy of Moravia find equal support both at the court of Rome and at that of Byzantium. Moravian missionaries, beginning with Cyril and Methodius, exhibit an equal confidence in the ecclesiastical authority emanating from the old and the new Rome. As for other burning issues, such as those of Bulgaria or of Illyricum, they are either compromised upon or minimized. Byzantine arms, furthermore, are dispatched to save Italy from Moslem invasion, and success is attained.

Photius, in the unfortunate affair with Pope Nicholas, had seen only a national danger to cope with, a threat of civil war because of a Latin personage whose action was interfering with his own within the sphere of Byzantine political affairs, and he had risked his own position by dangerously approximating the issue to the ecclesiastical plane. The West itself justly perceived in this a question of doctrine touching on

---

[1] Cf. F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism,* Cambridge University Press, 1948; and V. Grumel, A.A., "New Light on the Photian Schism", *Unitas,* V, p. 140.

the primacy of the Pope with serious implications for the religious future of Christianity and the unity of the Roman Church. Rome, as was the case during the period of iconoclasm, had wished to defend the cause of the oppressed (and also to prevent a dangerous precedent—arbitrariness in the nomination of bishops or patriarchs) just as, in spite of the weakness of the Lorrainian episcopate, she had once protected the queen Theutberga against Lothar II who wished to discard her. Two conceptions, two psychologies were at odds.

A Champion of the East

But still, why is it that Photius, who knew how to bear up with changes of fortune under the emperors and who was very much the stoic in such cases, should offer such violent and so astounding a resistance when the Pope required an explanation? It is because in the background there loomed up Byzantium which, on the one hand demanded sacrifice as the price of internal concord, and which, on the other, seemed to appeal for a vindicator to stem the betrayals and the encroachments of the West. One might grant that the respective civilizations and religious polity of Rome and Constantinople were on an equal plane, but then there was the question of a people regarded as uncultivated and thus suspected of introducing unwonted practices into the Church to the detriment of a venerable tradition. On the one side, further, there was the prestige of the new Rome; and on the other there was the jockeying for power in Illyricum, discontent in Moravia, and rival influences in Bulgaria. The man of the East is exasperated at seeing his plans compromised by the Occident; a veil seems to obscure the faith of the Patriarch who has not realized that genuine nobility of soul, as of sanctity, would have bowed in submission to the Pope of ancient Rome. The reaction of Photius was, to be sure, more an outburst of temper than a matter of set purpose, since in other more favorable circumstances he will amend his comportment; the comprehension of the Pope, reflected in a gentler *modus agendi,* smooths the way towards an understanding and preserves the Church from schism.

The Photius of the Polemists an Historical Aberration

During those eras of violence when it was not rare to see a bishop of the West, like Hincmar for example, rebel openly against the supreme authority and defy it, the resultant scandal was happily amended and just as quickly forgotten. People of our day and age may read that name on some street plaque and for the most part suspect nothing of the conflicts occurring during the epoch under discussion which in the course of a few regional synods even brought the illustrious Remois, counsellor of the kings of France, into conflict with Pope Nicholas.

If some of the Byzantine polemicists, even during the lifetime of Photius, had not found it to their interest to rekindle discord, to hurl dishonest insinuations against the good faith of their episcopal superiors, doubtless Rome and the West would have lost sight quickly of the Photian affair. But unfortunately, there were those who thought it a clever move to revive this painful conflict in a provoking way just at the moment when political and national passions had become exasperated. Michael Cerularius and the Crusades unscrupulously exploited the events of the ninth century. Documents were falsified and phrases from them were either removed or interpolated. Photius was made to be a rebel against authority and a forerunner of Luther when he had been but a servant of Byzantium, buffeted by his enemies, and by that very fact blundering into a capital error. He was well aware of this afterwards, but he nevertheless, in paying due reverence to the Pope, wished to safeguard his own prestige which he identified with the honor of his nation. It was with this spirit and with this end in view that he worked with the Pope of Rome towards re-establishing peace and preserving the unity of the Church.

BERNARD LEIB, S.J.

RELATIONS BETWEEN CONSTANTINOPLE AND MOSCOW

Both Constantinople and Moscow were comparatively late-comers into the ranks of the greatest Christian Sees. For three centuries the outstanding centres of Christianity were Rome, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch. It was only when Constantine the Great moved the capital of his empire eastwards to Byzantium that the city of Constantine—Constantinople—really emerged into Christian history. But its development thereafter was rapid. From having only a bishop dependent on the Metropolitan of Heraclea, it was given an archbishop, and he very soon was vying with the archbishops of the older 'patriarchal' Sees for pre-eminence. That was inevitable, because he was the titular of the capital city of an empire which included within itself the territories of all the 'patriarchates'.[1] The results were soon apparent—tension particularly between Alexandria which resented this novel relationship and Constantinople, manifested in, for example, the attitude of Dioscoros at the 'Robber Council' and the Council of Chalcedon; tension to some degree between Rome and Constantinople, because the latter claimed equality of prerogatives, though it was content at least temporarily with the second place in precedence, as it was now what old Rome had been, the seat of government.

History favoured the ecclesiastical development of Constantinople. The Arab invasion overran the territories of all the other eastern patriarchates and reduced their importance, and Rome politically broke away from the East and expanded its influence westwards. In the great Byzantine empire Constantinople was supreme. Ecclesiastically, till some indefinite time after the schism of Caerularius, the two Romes were united, but in the course of centuries they had in practice drifted apart owing to differences of language, culture, and custom. Both were great missionary forces; and the first systematic Christianisation of the Slav races was the result of the labours of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, of eastern rite as members of the Byzantine Church, but consecrated bishops at Rome. It was they who gave a liturgy to the Slavs, a liturgy based on that of Constantinople, in the Slav language. Russia, too, received its definitive introduction to Christianity from the East when St. Vladimir, 'the Equal of the Apostols', returned from Constantinople to evangelize his people. Thereafter for many centuries the head of the Russian Church was either appointed or approved at Constantinople and was consecrated there. So the Slav races from the beginning were within the orbit of Constantinople rather than that of Rome.

It was the question of who should be Metropolitan of All Russia that provoked the first movement in favour of independence of the

---

[1] Patriarchal and patriarchate are written in inverted commas because, being names of later origin, they are not strictly correct for this earlier period.

Russian Church. Russia rejected the union of East and West arrived at in the Council of Florence (1439), and with it the Metropolitan for Russia, appointed and consecrated by the Patriarch of Constantinople before the Council, and after it made by the Pope cardinal legate for the work of promoting the union. In his place it elected a metropolitan of its own choice. That was a break with both Rome and Constantinople. The latter city, in any case, was at that time in no position to react, for it was in its death throes in the face of the Turkish invasion. It fell to the Turk in 1453, the last of the Greek patriarchates to lose its liberty. Thereafter all the Greek Churches were subject to Turkish domination, and the number of their faithful steadily diminished through persecution, enforced conversion to Islamism and slavery. The Christian Church of the East lost prestige and importance, though the patriarchs of Constantinople continued to exist, their elections needing Turkish approval, their continuance in office depending in no small measure on political intrigue, but their importance to a certain extent enhanced, for the Sultans looked on them as heads of the Orthodox communities in his empire and used them as such in their political organisation. The Russian was the only free Orthodox Church. Russia itself was growing in unity and power. Its Czars were Christians and Orthodox. It was becoming what Constantinople had been, and began to think of itself as the Third Rome, that is, the new centre of Christian orthodoxy, where State and Church were co-terminous, replacing the first Rome which had fallen into 'heresy' and the second Rome which was languishing under the despotism of Islam.

* * *

So, with the turn of the historical wheel, Moscow came to be generally regarded as the chief of the Orthodox Churches. In 1589 it was erected into a patriarchate, though not with the third place in order of precedence as it has asked, but in the fifth as the youngest. But the older patriarchates to some degree depended on it for financial aid, and many were the pilgrimages made to request help, and never in vain. It alone had the possibility of development in organisation and learning. The number of its faithful grew, while those of the other Churches dwindled. It became therefore, the dominant force in the Orthodox world, with the Czar the recognized protector of Orthodox institutions and interests, even outside his own dominions. When the English Non-jurors wanted to make contact with the Orthodox Church, they addressed themselves to Peter the Great. When, more than two centuries later, Americans and English of the Anglican communion thought of cultivating relations with the Orthodox, it was to Russia that they turned.

All that was drastically changed with the advent of Bolshevism. True, the revolution of 1917 allowed the Church to elect its first patriarch in two centuries, but it was not long before he found himself in

prison. Churches were closed or used for secular purposes: priests were imprisoned and refused recognition as 'workers' and so deprived of food-cards and the means of livelihood: seminaries and institutions confiscated: printing and education forbidden to religion. Communication with the outer world ceased. A certain number of ecclesiastics escaped with many of the layfolk into exile, but before long there was division between them. In Russia itself there arose local and schismatical Churches, to some extent encouraged by the Bolshevist authorities so as to weaken the position of the Patriarchal Church. Russia ceased to be, and to be regarded as, the main Orthodox Church. The Ecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople returned into pre-eminence.

An encyclical letter that emanated from the Patriarchate in January 1920 addressed to all sister-Churches and suggesting community of action in social problems showed that it was aware of its newly-found dignity. The political situation that resulted from the first World War soon gave it further opportunity of action. The Treaty of Versailles had re-established an independent Poland and given autonomy to some small peoples in the north—among them Finland and Esthonia. In all of those countries there were at the least large groups of Orthodox Christians who until lately had been within the Orthodox Russian Church and now lived under a political régime hostile to the Russian government. It was natural that they should want to separate themselves also ecclesiastically from Russia. So, unable to get satisfaction from the Church of Moscow, they turned to Constantinople, and there their plea was granted. Finland and Esthonia were made autonomous in 1923; Poland was given autocephaly in 1924, and Dionysius of Warsaw was recognised as head of the Polish Church. In 1923 also the Patriarch of Constantinople instituted an archbishopric with four suffragan Sees for Czechoslovakia, himself consecrating the archbishop. In the same year he invited the heads of all autocephalous Churches to a common conference where far-reaching resolutions were made on the adoption of a new calendar and the marriage of priests—but none of the other patriarchates sent representatives (Russia, of course, could not), and later Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem firmly rejected the resolutions. In 1931 Eulogius, Metropolitan at Paris of the Russians in exile, on being deprived of his office by Sergius of Moscow put himself under the obedience of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which declared all Russian Churches in Europe to be subject to itself until Russia found a new freedom, and placed Eulogius in charge of them. Another Prosynod of all Orthodoxy was projected for June 1932, for which a syllabus of agenda was drawn up in 1930, but it never took place owing to the hostility of the Turkish government.

* * *

In 1945 the scene changed radically again when the Soviet government, in view presumably of the support it had received from the Church in its struggle against Germany, became more liberal in its

attitude. Already in 1943 it had allowed the Church to hold a pan-Russian Synod where it elected a patriarch, and now it relaxed many of the restrictions that had oppressed it, giving back certain churches and institutions, allowing ecclesiastical education under guarded conditions, and according to it governmental protection—indeed governmental supervision, for the central government of the Church and of each diocese were each allotted a State commissar. Another reason for the Bolshevist *volte face* was probably the fact that it had realised how useful the Church could be as a bond of union with the many peoples that it was rapidly gathering into the Bolshevist fold. For as the Russian forces occupied one country after another the different Orthodox Churches hastened to put themselves under the Russian Patriarch's patronage. Moscow could take up the mantle of St. Petersburg as the protector of the Orthodox, and Russian influence could be spread under an ecclesiastical covering.

Alexius was the man elected in 1945 to the Patriarch of Moscow. He was soon active. Within a year he had sent his representatives round all the Orthodox Churches that lay within Russian influence and also to America. In 1947 he issued an invitation to all Orthodox Churches to attend a pan-Orthodox conference to be held in Moscow to discuss questions of common interest. It was perhaps a *ballon d'essai* to see how the non-Slav Churches would react. Constantinople declined the invitation with a reminder that the initiative in such pan-Orthodox movements lay with her as being the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In Greece a violent article appeared in the official periodical of the Church with the title: *The Clashing Rocks,* in which the Bishop of Zakinthos portrayed the Church of Constantinople as exposed to a double menace emanating respectively from Rome and Moscow. Alexius withdrew his invitation on the pretext that it had been rather premature and had not allowed sufficient time for an adequate preparation for so important an event.

But Moscow was not daunted by the reception accorded to its gesture of 1947. The following year was the fifth centenary of the autonomy of the Russian Church and provided an admirable reason for inviting all the sister-Churches to join in celebrating the event, an invitation which they could hardly refuse without grave discourtesy. So invitations went out again, and the Russian government lent its aid to make the celebration memorable, putting also aeroplanes at the disposal of the guest-representatives. All the Greek Churches (except Jerusalem and Cyprus) sent delegates, Antioch's envoy representing also Alexandria. The pan-Orthodox conference that failed to materialise in 1947 was tacked on to the end of the centenary celebration, but the delegates of Constantinople and Greece resolutely refused to take part; the representative of Antioch did join in, but whether also in his capacity as envoy of Alexandria is uncertain. So the Slav Churches agreed unanimously on a variety of resolutions, inveighing against the Pope,

rejecting participation in the Ecumenical Movement, and refusing to recognize Anglican Ordinations till some doctrinal changes were made in Anglican formularies; but they did this without the participation of the main Greek Churches.

The conference projected by Alexius of Moscow in 1947 and *The Clashing Rocks* of Chrysostom of Zakinthos touched off the spark that ignited a fierce controversy that continued for the next few years. The protagonist on the Russian side was Prof. Troitsky writing in the *Journal of the Patriarchate of Moscow*. The main defenders of the traditional rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate were Prof. Emmanuel Photiades and Germanos, Metropolitan of Ainos, both of the Constantinopolitan Church. The Church of Greece contributed little; Alexandria, divided between its ancient antipathy to Constantinople and its apprehensions about Russia, blew both hot and cold; Antioch, recipient of Russian bounty, remained silent, as did, too, Jerusalem which numbers only a few hundred Greeks among its thousands of adherents—the rest are Arab—and which in any case is too involved in domestic problems after the Israeli-Arab partition to have time for other questions.

The main Russian grounds of complaint were three—firstly, that Constantinople was completely unjustified in granting autocephalousness to Poland and autonomy to Finland and Esthonia, as this fell within the province of their mother-Church of Russia; secondly, that Constantinople had no exclusive rights of jurisdiction over the Orthodox diaspora, i.e. over all Orthodox living outside the strict territories of an Orthodox Church; and thirdly, that, whatever the custom in the past, the Ecumenical Patriarchate had no exclusive right to summon pan-Orthodox gatherings. The writers on the Greek side naturally rejected all three complaints as unfounded. Both sides appealed to traditional practice and particularly to the ancient canons.

As regards the argument from tradition, the two parties were agreed by and large on the facts, that from the earliest times Constantinople had, as much after as before its capture by the Turk in 1453, wielded a wide jurisdiction not only in territories that belonged to no patriarchate or Church, but even within the other Churches. The defenders of the Ecumenical throne claimed that such interference had been to the benefit of the Church at large, and concluded that history demonstrated that Constantinople had always interpreted the canons in the same way and that the other patriarchates had acquiesced in that interpretation and, acquiescing, approved it. Indeed the very *Tomos* that accorded patriarchal status to Moscow, signed by three Eastern patriarchs and 81 metropolitans and bishops, specifically declared that the Russian Patriarch 'like the other patriarchs should hold the apostolic throne of Constantinople as head and principal'. The argument from the other side attributes the position of the Church of Constantinople to the accidental circumstances of history. Before the fall of the Byzantine capital, it was the centre of all State, and therefore also

ecclesiastical, activity, and as such the seat of the *Synodus endemousa,* i.e. the permanent synod made up of such bishops as happened to be in the capital (and there were always many such when first the Arab and then the Turk possessed their countries); so it was inevitable that the Patriarch should enjoy a preponderating influence. After 1453 he was made by the Sultan ecclesiastical, and to some degree also political, head of all Orthodox Christians within the Turkish domains, and so once again all Church-business passed through his hands. In neither case was his position based on rights according to the canons. An abuse does not confer a right. The only rights that the Church must acknowledge are those established by the canons, and of such Constantinople has no more than any other autocephalous Church.

The canons to which both sides appealed were chiefly the following. The 2nd canon of Constantinople I (381) lays down: 'Churches among barbarian nations should be administered according to the established custom of the Fathers', while the 3rd canon of the same Council allotted to Constantinople the place next after Rome in order of precedence. The 8th canon of Ephesus (431) reads; 'No one of the God—beloved bishops should occupy another eparchy that is not by tradition and from the beginning subject to him; but if he has occupied it and made it subject to himself by violence, he should restore it'. The Council of Chalcedon (451) provided the most controversial canon, the so-called 28th, where after again putting Constantinople in the second place the relevant part runs as follows: 'The metropolitan of the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses and they only, and further those bishops of the aforesaid dioceses who are among the barbarians, should be consecrated by the aforesaid most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople'. Finally the 9th and 17th canons of the same Council of Chalcedon refer disputants who cannot agree in a lower court to take the case 'to the exarch of the district or the throne of Constantinople'.

On the basis of these canons Prof. Troitsky concluded that Constantinople was in no better case than any other Church. The first 2 canons quoted do not even mention Constantinople—they are general and apply to her, forbidding interference in the territories of other Churches, as much as to any other, and so give no grounds for any alleged universal jurisdiction over the diaspora. The second of them had in fact a special case in view, namely Antioch's pretensions over Cyprus. Even Constantinople's second place in precedence was limited by the cause assigned for it—as being the city of the emperor; strictly speaking it should have lost its rank when it lost its political position. Similarly the 28th canon of Chalcedon does not avail to support ecumenical claims. It does indeed extend the area of jurisdiction of Constantinople, but within clear and specifically defined limits, to 'the Pontic, Asian, and Thracian dioceses and those bishops of the aforesaid dioceses among the barbarians'—not therefore universally and exclusively. So on the basis of the canons the patriarchal throne of

Constantinople has no general and exclusive rights over the Orthodox diaspora or right of interference in the affairs of other Churches.

On the Greek side the canons are interpreted differently. The 3rd canon of Constantinople I accorded to Constantinople the second position after Rome, and within a few years the holder of that See was in fact intervening in the affairs of other patriarchates (witness e.g. the action of St. John Chrysostom). The 8th canon of Ephesus was admittedly occasioned by the Antioch-Cyprus quarrel, but it was couched in general terms and laid down a general regulation to prevent other, similar disputes. So this canon, together with the 2nd canon of Constantinople I and the definition of the areas subject to Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem of the Council of Nicaea, clearly prove that no other Church has any canonical right of action outside of its own boundaries as established by an Ecumenical Council or by an act of the Ecumenical Patriarchate granting it autocephalousness. The Patriarch of Constantinople and he alone has such a right in virtue of the 28th canon of Chalcedon by which Pontus, Asia, and Thrace are made subject to him and also all bishops 'among the barbarians'. Prof. Troitsky, so say the Greek apologists, unduly limits the meaning of that last phrase by understanding it to mean 'among barbarian nations': if any word is to be understood to supplement the sense it should be 'areas', for it is quite general in its significance. Then, too, the other canons of Chalcedon quoted above clearly make Constantinople a court of appeal for the whole of Orthodoxy.

The only contribution from Alexandria that came to the theoretical discussion of the controversy was not very happy. It was an article over the initial 'W' with a double title: "Has the Ecumenical Patriarchate rights as a Court of Appeal? Is the Ecumenical Patriarch alone entitled to summon Ecumenical or Pan-Orthodox Synods?" On the first question 'W' decides that Constantinople has no right of universal appeal, for the canons give it none, not even the 9th and 17th of Chalcedon where 'district' is limited to Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. But in fact Constantinople has always exercised such a right and usually well, so (he concludes), though with no right, the Ecumenical Patriarch has a duty as first of the Orthodox patriarchs and actual head of the *Synodus endemousa*. The writer answers the second question by saying that, provided 'the Ecumenical Patriarchs for the future limit their claims of rank to only the initiative in every common action of the whole Church, then indeed it will be possible for there to be attributed to them by the other patriarchs the right of summoning the whole Church to synod or synods . . . under the presidency of all the patriarchs but with the Ecumenical Patriarch taking precedence'—but if he would not or could not act, the senior in rank of the Churches should do so. The Archbishop of Ainos in 53 crown-octave pages of gentle irony and sad reproof answered 'W's' article, pointing out some of his limitations of scholarship. Prof. Troitsky while in general ap-

proving of 'W's' conclusions indicated their lack of logic and himself inferred from his reasoning: No right, therefore no duty.

* * *

It was not to be expected that the controversy between the two great patriarchates would for ever remain a paper warfare. On the Russian side at least it was clearly meant to be the prelude, and justification, for action. The first move was in regard to Poland. By letters dated 11 July 1949 the Patriarch of Moscow informed the Ecumenical Patriarch and the heads of other autocephalous Churches that by a decision of the preceding 22 June the Holy Synod of Russia had granted to the Polish Church the rights of an autocephalous Church and had appointed Timotheus, Archbishop of Bjalystok, to preside over it. Athenagoras of Constantinople replied on 23 February 1950 approving the autocephalousness of the Polish Church and reminding the Russian Patriarch that 'the most holy, Ecumenical throne which, by reason of its historical connections with that ecclesiastical territory and of the unique position within the system of Orthodox autocephalous Churches accruing to it from the sacred canons and the age-long practice of the Church, as also from its duty to assist and aid ecclesiastical areas in distress, in November 1924 had blessed the autocephalousness of the Orthodox Church of Poland, which had shown all the conditions requisite for this, according to the sacred canons'. He wrote, too, to the other Orthodox Churches of which two, at least, Cyprus and Alexandria, replied both to him and to Moscow condemning the Russian step as 'uncanonical' and 'opposed to ancient practice and tradition'. But Moscow was not to be moved. In two further letters to the Ecumenical Patriarch it reasserted that the right of raising the Polish Church to the status of autocephaly lay only with itself, the Mother-Church, and so Constantinople's action in 1924 was unjustified and uncanonical.

1950 saw the Stockholm Peace Appeal that was warmly supported by the Russian Church. As part of the propaganda in favour of the Appeal (and another excellent opportunity for assuming an hegemony over Orthodoxy), Alexius of Moscow invited the support of the other Orthodox Churches, suggesting for this end a common conference. None of the Greek Churches accepted the Russian lead, and Constantinople, while declining the invitation, brought to Russian notice again that proposals for combined Orthodox action should emanate from the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

As a result, no doubt, of the polemical pressure brought to bear on him by the repeated articles inspired by the authorities of the Russian Church and warmly supported by Alexandria, Athenagoras decided to anticipate any further moves from Moscow by initiating negotiations for a pan-Orthodox synod. On 12 February 1951 he addressed letters to all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches 'to submit once again to the judgement of the sister-Churches the question of the

summoning of the Prosynod' and invited them to acquaint him with their views on the matter and those of their Churches. The answers were surprising. In spite of the fact that the literature on the subject during the previous years had created an impression of urgency and of a general desire for such a synod, only Alexandria was found to be in favour. The rest considered it premature and inopportune. Here is the relevant part of the answer from Moscow: 'Yet at the present time one cannot help noticing that over the last ten years relations between the sister-Churches have been so disturbed that, without serious preparation of the ground towards a unanimous solution of the questions that have arisen over so long a time, there is no hope of the possibility of a universally-accepted solution of these questions in a general ecclesiastical synod. Recognising therefore that at present this ground has not been prepared, that it is not yet by any means clear exactly what questions are submitted to general study, that there are many outstanding, unsolved problems in regard to relations between the Churches—after study of this question from every side, . . . we think that the summoning of a Prosynod, as proposed by Your Holiness, seems to be premature and in need of an antecedent, careful preparation. Perhaps as part of the preparatory work, Your Holiness may find it useful to send to the various local Churches for previous private study a list of questions submitted for solution to Prosynodical consideration'.

In view, therefore, of the replies received to his invitation, the Ecumenical Patriarch notified the Churches on 25 September 1952 that the Prosynod was temporarily deferred, and at the same time he proposed as agenda for it the topics that had been prepared in 1930 for the projected synod of 1932. His letter was approved by most of the Churches, but not by that of Russia which was not satisfied with the suggested agenda. Replying on 7 March 1953 and recognising the urgent necessity of a Prosynod, the Patriarch Alexius urged that before then various questions that divided the Churches should be settled, particularly those in dispute between Russia and Constantinople—the autonomy granted to Finland in 1923 by the Ecumenical Patriarchate, the non-recognition of the autocephaly accorded by the Mother-Church Russia to Poland and Czechoslovakia. The whole question of the election of bishops and heads of Churches ought, he said, to be examined, but meantime those carried out according to local tradition, as in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Albania, should be accepted, and the granting of autocephaly, for lack of other norms about it, be left to the Mother-Churches. The Patriarch of Alexandria, too, was dissatisfied. He wanted the Prosynod to be held as quickly as possible, and this new delay irked him. He showed his ill-humor by writing to the Russian Church and offering alternative agenda for the meeting.

Meanwhile Alexius of Russia had not let the project of the Prosynod restrain him from further action, for on 23 November 1951 the Holy Synod of Russia had granted autocephaly to the Orthodox Church

of Czechoslovakia. Then on 30 March 1953 the Church of Bulgaria, obviously with the approval of Moscow, informed the other Churches that it was about to hold a synod whose main purpose would be the election of a patriarch. Relations between Constantinople and Bulgaria had for long been delicate. When Bulgaria, on gaining independence from the Turk in 1872 had declared itself an autonomous Church, though Czarist Russia recognised its independence, Constantinople had excommunicated it, and the ban was not lifted till 1945. So when in 1953 it informed the Ecumenical Patriarchate that it was about to elect a patriarch, on the grounds that for some four centuries till 1393, when it was overwhelmed by the Turk, the head of the Bulgarian Church had been entitled patriarch, though after its reconstitution in 1872 he had been named only exarch, and invited Athenagoras to honour his enthronement, to take place on 10 May 1953, by the sending of representatives, it could hardly expect an answer of effusive congratulation. Nor did it get it. The Ecumenical Patriarch in a letter of 25 April intimated his disapproval, characterising the action as an innovation, one-sided and uncanonical. Greece, Jerusalem, Serbia and, though somewhat enigmatically, also Alexandria replied to similar invitations in the same sense; but when Cyril, the new Patriarch was enthroned, Moscow and Antioch were represented at the ceremony, and Georgia, Romania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia approved the step.

The attitude of the Church of Alexandria on all these questions is far from clear. In fact there seems to exist a double attitude, that of the Church and that of the Patriarch, which is not altogether surprising because on other questions of domestic policy there is a long-standing quarrel between the Patriarch and his clerics which the Mohammedan government has been called in to try to settle. *Pantainos*, the organ of the Alexandrian Patriarchate, has in the course of 1953 published several articles reproving the Church of Russia for its attitude towards the Ecumenical Patriarchate and blaming Moscow for the divisions that rend Orthodoxy. Yet at more or less the same time Christopher of Alexandria was congratulating Eleutherius of Czechoslovakia on the autocephalousness of his Church and was giving an interview to newspaper correspondents in which he was inveighing against Constantinople for its inability or unwillingness to convoke a Prosynod and declaring that, as Constantinople was no longer the capital of a Christian empire, Moscow could well now assume leadership of the Orthodox Church. A little later he was sounding Antioch on what its reaction would be if he, Christopher, as holder of the second throne after Constantinople were to take the initiative in the summoning of the Prosynod. The suggestion was not well received.

* * *

The position of the Ecumenical Patriarch is now-a-days a very difficult one. The Church of Constantinople is one of the smallest of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches, and is situated in a country pre-

dominantly Mohammedan, so that its relations with the civil government are always delicate. It has behind it a long tradition of hegemony over the sister-Churches, but a hegemony only of the first place among equals. That position is now being seriously challenged by the Slav group of Orthodox Churches which contains the greater number of the Orthodox Churches, and they the numerically largest are knit together by their dependence on Moscow. Its defenders are less united, besides being smaller in number. Apart from the Orthodox of the European diaspora and of America mostly dependent upon the Ecumenical Patriarch, its main support is the Church of Greece.

Why, under these conditions, Moscow did not grasp with avidity the occasion of the invitation of the Ecumenical Patriarch to the pan-Orthodox synod, as a heaven-sent opportunity for asserting Slav influence over all Orthodoxy is somewhat of a mystery. Perhaps Alexius shrank from accentuating further the divisions within the Orthodox Church and weakening its general position in the eyes of the Christian world. Perhaps, since Constantinople would not for a moment have contemplated holding the synod on the far side of the Iron Curtain, he may have doubted whether the Bolshevik government would have risked letting so many leading ecclesiastical personalities—all the Churches would have had to send representatives—escape even for a time into the free world. They might have been contaminated, or they might even not have come back.

J. GILL, S.J.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

TWO RECENT IMPORTANT PAPAL DOCUMENTS

Among the many notable papal pronouncements which have appeared during the last few months, two at least will be of special interest to the readers of Unitas. *The first of these is a letter addressed to the Abbot of the Byzantine Rite Monastery of Grottaferrata, south of Rome, to mark the ninth centenary of the death of St. Bartholomew of Rossano, fourth abbot and "second founder" of the monastery. In his message, the Pope extends his good wishes to the community of monks and at the same time takes occasion to make a plea for the reunion of the separated East with Rome.*

The second document is the text of an address delivered in French to participants in the tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences which was held in Rome in the early part of September. Touching upon the all-important subject of the Church in the domain of history, Pope Pius in his discourse explained "how the Church sees herself as an historical phenomenon" and how she has gone about propagating the message entrusted to her through space and time.

Translations of these important documents follow, the first of which is that appearing in the London Tablet *of August 13.*

I. *THE POPE'S LETTER TO GROTTAFERRATA*

We have learned with much pleasure of the zealous care which has inspired you, beloved son, and your other brethren to celebrate the ninth centenary of the holy death of St. Bartolomew the Less, fourth Abbot of your community, and We approve it highly.

For it cannot but be most acceptable to Us that special honour should be paid to that light of the Church, whose splendid achievements were an adornment not only to the monastic state but also to this Apostolic See; and it is most appropriate that you should honour the memory of so great a man, who deserves to be known as the second father of your monastic institute, which was founded by St. Nilos. For after the death of the Founder, who had barely laid the first foundations of your monastery in the plain of Tusculum, it was not without God's providential will that it fell to St. Bartholomew the Less, once he had been raised to the abbatial dignity, to complete the work which had been begun by St. Nilos, and to lay down wise rules for its governance. And it is chiefly due to his prudence, sound observance, and sanctity that the noble offshoot of this form of Eastern religious life, having been transferred to the West, should still, after so many centuries, be exerting its healthful influence within the Church.

Among much else which occurs to Our mind on this occasion, We desire to set forth something which it is of particular importance to consider, especially in these days. That is, that whenever the memory of the ages of St. Bartholomew and of the foundation of your monastery recurs, the mind turns with regret and desire to something which was lost in the disaster of a long-distant period: We mean the ancient union, unmarred by schism, whereby the Greeks were not separated from the Roman Church, but were together in a single sheepfold, under the rule and governance of the Vicar of Christ. Wherefore, it was a happy circumstance that, as St. Bartholomew the Less testifies, your Lawgiver and Father, 'in order to provide a place and a monastery wherein he might gather all his brethren and dispersed sons' (*Vita S. Nili:* Migne, P. G., vol. 120, col. 158), sought a generous reception in this holy City; where your Institute flourished marvellously under the protection of the Roman Pontiffs, and indeed still stands out in our own day as a notable witness to that former unity, strong in the Roman faith, united in all friendship to the Greek tongue and the Greek liturgical discipline.

If all this is considered without prejudice, why should not the biased opinions which have for so long kept innumerable sons away from the bosom of Mother Church gradually, with God's help, yield to the truth? Indeed, the peoples of the East have nothing to fear from re-establishing unity with the Roman Church, or from a much to be desired and necessary return to her; they will lose nothing whatever of the dignity and splendour of their liturgy, or of the revered inheritance of discipline which they have received from their fathers; rather will they enjoy no small increase of strength and glory.

There is therefore, beloved sons, reason why you should not only consider in your minds these things, which are so important for Catholic unity, in the course of your anniversary celebrations, but also strive to give public expression to them and set them in their proper light.

Meanwhile do you, remembering the virtue and example of so great a father, follow firmly in his footsteps, and endeavour with great zeal to mirror forth in yourselves the brightness of his sanctity. And that this many turn out as We would wish, We impart to you, beloved son, and to all your brethren, the Apostolic Benediction, most lovingly in the Lord.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's on the 30th day of the month of June in the year 1955, the seventeenth of Our pontificate. — Pius PP. XII.

II. *DISCOURSE OF THE HOLY FATHER TO THE TENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF HISTORICAL SCIENCES*

It has been your desire, Gentlemen, to come in great numbers to pay Us a visit on the occasion of the Tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences; it is with pleasure that We receive you and with the conviction that this event is one of highly special significance. Never before, perhaps, has a group of such distinguished historical scholars convened at Rome, the centre of the Church and the dwelling-place of the Pope. Yet we do not feel that We are meeting people who are unknown to Us and strangers. In fact, many of you will have been among the thousands who have laboured in the Vatican Library or in the Archives, which are open now exactly seventy-five years. And, besides, your activity as students, or as professors, will have given occasion to the majority, if not to all, of you to enter into contact, in some way, with the Catholic Church and the Papacy.

Although history is an ancient science, it has had to await recent times and the development of historical criticism to attain to that perfection of which it can now boast. Thanks to the rigorous requirements of its methods and to the untiring zeal of its specialists, you are able to rejoice in a more detailed knowledge of the past, and in an ability to pass judgment on it with greater exactitude than any others of your precedessors. This fact also underlines the importance we attribute to your presence here.

History ranks among those sciences that are intimately connected with the Catholic Church. So much so, that We were unable just now to offer you Our welcome without, almost involuntarily, mentioning this fact. The Catholic Church is herself a historical fact; like a powerful chain of mountains she traverses the history of the last two milleniums. No matter what be the attitude adopted in her regard, she cannot be overlooked. The judgments expressed on the Church have been most diverse, from total acceptance of her, to absolute rejection. Whatever be the final verdict of the historian—whose task it is to see and expound, as far as possible exactly as they have happened, facts, events, and circumstances—the Church claims the right to expect from him that, in every case, he will inform himself of the knowledge the Church has of herself, i.e., of the manner in which she looks upon herself as a historical fact, and upon her relations with human society.

On the knowledge that the Church has of herself, We shall touch briefly by citing some facts, circumstances, concepts which seem to Us to bear a more fundamental significance.

To begin with, We would like to refute an objection that presents itself, so to speak, at first sight. Christianity, it was said and is still being said, necessarily assumes in the face of history a hostile attitude, because it sees in history a manifestation of evil and of sin; Catholicism

and historicism are concepts that are antithetical. Let Us point out, from the start, that that objection formulated in this way considers history and historicism to be equivalent concepts. In this it errs. The term *historicism* indicates a philosophical system, one which perceives in all spiritual reality, in the knowledge of truth, in religion, morality, and law, nothing but change and evolution, and rejects as a consequence all that which is permanent, of eternal value, and absolute. Such a system is, assuredly, irreconciliable with the Catholic Church's concept of the world, and, in general, with any religion that recognises a personal God.

The Catholic Church knows that all events take place according to the will, or with the permission, of divine Providence, and that God attains in history His objectives. As the great St. Augustine has said with a precision that is classical, what God intends "hoc fit, hoc agitur; etsi paulatim peragitur, indesinenter agitur." God is truly the Lord of history.

This affirmation already answers of itself the objection mentioned. Between Christianity and history there cannot be found to exist any opposition in the sense that history might be nothing else but an emanation or manifestation of evil. The Catholic Church has never taught such a doctrine. Since Christian antiquity, since the patristic period, but especially during the spiritual conflict with Protestantism and Jansenism, she has taken a clear position on the side of nature, from which she asserts that sin has not corrupted it, that it has remained interiorly intact even in fallen man, that men before the coming of Christianity, and those who are not Christians, could and can perform good and upright acts. And this she asserts even abstracting from the fact that all humanity, including those who lived before the advent of Christianity, is under the influence of the grace of Christ.

The Church willingly recognises good and great achievements, even those performed before her own coming, and those outside her own domain. St. Augustine himself, on whom those in opposition willingly rely by a wrong interpretation of his *De Civitate Dei* and who does not hide his pessimism, even he is absolutely clear. To the Imperial Tribune and notary, Flavius Marcellinus, to whom he dedicates this great work he writes in effect: "For in all the manifold activity of the extremely wealthy and marvelous Roman Empire, God revealed how precious civil virtues could be even without the true religion, so that one might understand that with it men become citizens of another state whose king is truth, whose law is love, and whose endurance is forever".[1] St. Augustine in these words has interpreted the constant opinion of the Church.

---

[1] "Deus enim sic ostendit in opulentissimo et praeclaro imperio Romano, quantum valerent civiles etiam sine vera religione, virtutes, ut intelligeretur, hac addita fieri homines cives alterius civitatis, cujus rex veritas, cujus lex caritas, cujus modus aeternitas." (Ep. 138, n. 17 - Migne P. L. t. 33, col. 533).

Let us speak for the moment of the Church herself as a historical fact. Whilst asserting fully her divine origin and her supernatural character, the Church is aware of having entered into humanity as a historical fact. Her divine Founder Jesus Christ is a historical personality. His life, his death, and His resurrection are historical facts. It has happened sometimes that even such as deny the divinity of Christ admit His resurrection because, in their opinion, this is too well attested historically. He who would deny it must wipe out all ancient history, because none of its facts is better proven than the resurrection of Christ. The mission and the development of the Church are historical facts. Here in Rome it is natural to cite St. Peter and St. Paul; Paul ranks, even from the purely historical point of view, among the most remarkable figures of humanity. With regard to the Apostle Peter and his position in the Church of Christ, although the monumental proof of his sojourn and death in Rome is not of essential importance for the Catholic faith, nevertheless, We have promoted the well-known excavations under the Basilica. The methods are those approved by modern criticism; the result, namely, the discovery of the tomb of St. Peter under the cupola—exactly under the Papal altar—was admitted by the vast majority of critics; and even the most extreme sceptics themselves were impressed by what the excavations brought to light. Moreover, We have reason to believe that further research and study will make possible the acquisition of new and most precious knowledge.

The origins of Christianity and of the Church are historical facts, proved and determined in space and time. Of this the Church is well aware. She also knows that her mission, even though belonging by its nature and its own objectives to the religious and moral domain, seated in the hereafter and in eternity, penetrates, nevertheless, right through human history. Ever and everywhere, adapting herself unceasingly to the circumstances of time and space, she wishes to shape, in keeping with the laws of Christ, persons, the individual, and, as far as possible, all individuals, thus arriving at the moral foundations of life in society. The objective of the Church is man naturally good, penetrated, ennobled, and fortified by the truth and the grace of Christ.

The Church wishes to produce men "firm in their inviolable integrity as images of God: men proud of their personal dignity and of their sane liberty; men justly jealous of their equality with their fellow-men in all that touches the most intimate citadel of human dignity; men deeply attached to their land and to their traditions"—such is the intention of the Church, just as we expressed it in our allocution of the 20th February 1946 when we conferred the biretta on the new Cardinals. We would add: in the present century as in the past, when the problems of the family, of society, of the state and the social order

have acquired an ever increasing and even a capital importance, the Church has spent herself to contribute to the solution of these questions and, it is Our belief, with some success. Nevertheless, the Church is convinced that she cannot labour more efficaciously than by continuing to form men in the manner which We have described.

To attain these ends the Church does not act merely as an ideological system. Undoubtedly, she is also defined as such, when one uses the expression "Catholicism" which is neither habitual to her nor fully adequate. She is indeed more than a simple ideological system; she is a reality like visible nature, like the people, or like the State. She is a very living organism with its proper finality and principle of life. Immutable in the constitution and structure which her divine Founder Himself gave her, she has accepted and accepts the elements that she needs or which she judges useful for her development or for her activity: men and human institutions, principles, and activities. Moreover the Church, spreading herself throughout the entire world, has undergone in the course of centuries various changes, but in her essence she has always remained identical with herself, because the multitude of elements that she has received was from the very beginning subjected to the same fundamental faith. The Church could be quite vast, she could also show herself inflexibly strict. If one considers her history as a whole, one can see that she has been the one and the other, with a sure instinct for what was the good of different peoples and of the whole of humanity. Also has she rejected all movements that were too naturalistic, contaminated in some way by the spirit of moral licence, as also all Gnostic tendencies, falsely spiritualistic and Puritan. The history of Canon Law up to the Code that is actually in vigour, furnishes a great number of significant proofs. Take, for example, ecclesiastical legislation on marriage and the recent pontifical declarations on the question of conjugal society and of the family in all their aspects. You will find there an example, among many others, of the manner in which the Church thinks and works.

In virtue of an analogical principle she has intervened regularly in the domain of public life, to guarantee the just equilibrium between duty and obligation on one side, and law and liberty on the other. Political authority has never possessed a patron more worthy of trust than the Catholic Church; because the Church bases the authority of the State on the will of the Creator, on the commandment of God. Precisely because she attributes to public authority a religious value, the Church has opposed herself to state arbitrariness, to tyranny in all its forms. Our Precedessor Leo XIII in his Encyclical *Immortale Dei* of the 1st Nov. 1885 has written: "Indeed those things in human society which make for the common good; those factors which are effectively set up against the license of leaders who serve the people ill; those which prevent the supreme power of the state from undue interference in municipal or domestic affairs; those which avail to the preservation of propriety, of human personality, and of the equality of rights among

individual citizens—of all these factors—as the monuments of past ages will attest—the Catholic Church has always been either the initiator, the promotor, or the guardian."[2] Since Leo XIII wrote those words 70 years ago, looking back on the past, he could not have foreseen the test to which the immediate future was about to put them. Today We believe we can say that the Church during these 70 years has shown herself faithful to her past, and even that the assertions of Leo XIII have been greatly surpassed.

* * *

We now come to treat two problems that merit very special attention, namely, the relations between the Church and the State, between the Church and culture.

In pre-Christian times the power of public authority, the State, embraced both the profane and the religious domains. The Catholic Church is aware that her divine Founder transferred to her the domain of religion, the religious and moral direction of men in all its extent, independently of the power of the State. Since that time there has existed a history of the relations between Church and State, and this history has intensely occupied the attention of scholars.

Leo XIII bound, so to speak, in a formula the proper nature of these relations, of which he gives a clear exposition in his encyclicals *Diturnum illum* (1885), *Immortale Dei* (1885), and *Sapientiae Christianae* (1890): the two powers, the Church as well as the State, are sovereign powers. Their nature, as well as the end which they pursue, fixes the limits within which they govern "iure proprio" (in their own right). Like the State, the Church also possesses a sovereign right over all that she needs to attain her end, even over material means. "Whatever, therefore, in human affairs is in any way sacred, whatever pertains to the worship of God or the salvation of souls, whether this be such of its very nature or whether it be considered such by virtue of a positive relation—all this is subject to the power and judgment of the Church".[3] The State and the Church are independent powers, but they must not on that account ignore one another, much less fight with one another. It is much more in conformity with nature and with the divine will that they collaborate in mutual understanding, since their activity is on behalf of the same subject, namely, the Catholic citizen. Of course, cases of conflict remain possible: as when the laws of the State run

---

[2] Revera quae res in civitate plurium ad communem salutem possunt: quae sunt contra licentiam principum populo male consulentium utiliter institutae: quae summam rempublicam vetant in municipalem, vel domesticam rem importunius invadere: quae valent ad decus, ad personam hominis, ad aequibilitatem juris in singulis civibus conservandam, earum rerum omnium Ecclesiam Catholicam vel inventricem, vel auspicem, vel custodem semper fuisse, superi rum aetatem monumenta testantur.

[3] Quidquid igitur est in rebus humanis quoquo modo sacrum, quidquid ad salutem animarum cultumve Dei pertinet, sive tale sit natura sua, sive rursus tale intelligatur propter causam ad quam refertur, id est omne in potestate arbitrioque Ecclesiae.

counter to the divine law, the Church has the moral obligation to oppose them.

It can be said that, with the exception of a few centuries, the formula of Leo XIII reflects more or less explicitly the conscience of the Church through the whole of the first millenium, as well as through the last four centuries; moreover, even during the intermediary period, there were those representing the doctrine of the Church, perhaps even the majority, who shared the same opinion.

When Our Precedessor Bonifice VIII said, on April 30th 1303, to the envoys of the German king Albert of Habsburg "... just as the moon possesses no light except that which it receives from the sun, so also no earthly power can possess any authority except that which it receives from the authority of the Church ... all authority proceeds from Christ and from Us as the Vicar of Jesus Christ", [4] it was there indeed a question of perhaps the most accentuated formulation of the medieval idea of the relations of the spiritual power and the temporal power. Men like Boniface drew from this idea the logical consequences. But even for them, it was normally only a question of the transmission of the authority as such, not of the designation of its holder; and it was in this sense that Boniface himself had stated the matter to the Consistory of 24th June 1302. [5] This medieval concept was conditioned by the age. Those who know its sources will probably admit that it would be even more surprising had it not appeared.

They will also concede perhaps that in accepting such struggles as that of the Investitures, the Church was defending highly spiritual and moral ideas, and that, from the time of the Apostles down to our own day, her efforts to remain independent of the civil power have always had as their aim the safeguarding of the liberty of religious convictions. Let no one offer as an objection that the Church scorns the personal convictions of those who do not think as she does. The Church considered and considers the voluntary abandonment of the true faith as a fault. When, from the beginning of the 13th century, such defection involved penal sanction on the part of both the spiritual and the civil powers, this was in order to avoid the disruption of the religious and ecclesiastical unity of the West. To non-Catholics the Church applies the principle laid down in the Code of Canon Law: "No one may be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will," [6] and considers that their convictions constitute a motive, though not always the principal one, for tolerance. We have dealt with this subject already in Our Allocution of the 6th Dec. 1953 to the Catholic Jurists of Italy. [7]

---

4 ... sicut luna nullum lumen habet, nisi quod recipit a sole, sic nec aliqua terrena potestas aliquid habet, nisi quod recipit ab ecclesiastica potestate ... omnes potestates ... sunt a Christo et a Nobis tamquam a vicario Jesu Christi. (Mon. Germ. Hist. LL. sect. IV, tom. IV, part 1, p. 139, 19-32).

5 Cfr. C. E. Bulaeus, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*, t. 4, Paris, 1688, pp. 21-33.

6 Ad amplexandam fidem catholicam nemo invitus cogatur. (Can. 1351).

7 Cf. *Unitas*, Vol. V, p. 244.

The historian ought not to forget that, if the Church and the State have known hours and years of struggle, there have existed, from the time of Constantine the Great down to recent times and even our own day, tranquil periods, often of long duration during which they both collaborated in the formation of the same subjects. The Church does not hide the fact that she considers in principle such collaboration as normal, and that she holds as the ideal the unity of peoples in the true religion and the unanimity of action between herself and the State. But she is aware also that from a certain time things have evolved instead in a different way, namely, towards the multiplicity of religious confessions and of concepts of life within the same national community —in which Catholics form a minority more or less strong. It may be interesting and even surprising for the historian to meet in the United States an example, among others, of the way in which the Church succeeds in flowering in the most varied situations.

In the history of the relations between the Church and the State, Concordats play, as you know, an important role. What We remarked with regard to them in the discourse already cited of the 6th Dec. 1953 is also valid where their historical appreciation is concerned. In the Concordats, We said, the Church seeks the juridical security and the independence necessary for her mission. "It is possible," We added, "for the Church and the State to proclaim in a Concordat their common religious conviction. But it can also happen that the Concordat may have for its object among others the prevention of quarrels on questions of principle, and the removal from the start of possible causes of conflict. When the Church has placed her signature on a Concordat, that covers all that is contained in it. But the underlying sense may contain nuances of which the two parties have distinct readings; it may signify an express approbation, but it can also indicate a mere tolerance according to . . . principles that serve as a norm for the coexistence of the Church and of the faithful with Powers and with men of another belief."

* * *

The Church and culture: the Catholic Church has exercised a powerful influence, even a decisive one, on the cultural development of the last two milleniums. But she is entirely convinced that the source of this influence is to be found in the spiritual element that is here, her religious and moral life, so much so that were this to be weakened, so would that same power to diffuse culture suffer, for example, that which she contributes to social order and social peace.

Many historians, or to be more exact, philosophers of history, consider the place of Christianity, and consequently of the Catholic Church, to be a "tardy event", "ein spätes Ergebnis", as Karl Jaspers thinks, [8] in the Western world. That the work of Christ was a tardy event is

---

[8] *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschicte,* Frankfurt/M - Hamburg 1955, p. 65.

a question which We have no intention of discussing here. Essentially, it is one that lacks interest, and moreover on the future of humanity one can do no more, in effect, than make conjectures. What concerns us is that the Church is aware of having received her mission and her task for all time to come and for all men, and as a consequence, of not being linked to any determined culture. St. Augustine of old was profoundly affected when the conquest of Rome by Alaric shook the Empire with the first convulsions that presaged its ruin; but he had never imagined that it would endure enternally. "Transient quae fecit ipse Deus; quanto citius quod condidit Romulus" he says; and in the *City of God* he has clearly distinguished the existence of the Church from the destiny of the Empire. In that his thought was Catholic.

That which is called the West or the Western World has undergone a profound modification since the Middle Ages: the religious split of the 16th century, rationalism and liberalism leading to the state of the nineteenth century, to its policy of force and its secularised civilization. It became then inevitable that the relations of the Catholic Church with the West should have suffered alteration. But the culture itself of the Middle Ages cannot be characterised as *the* Catholic culture; even that, although closely bound to the Church, drew its elements from diverse sources. Even the religious unity of the Middle Ages was not confined specifically to them. Such unity had been already typical of Christian antiquity in the Roman Empire of the East and of the West, from Constantine to Charlemagne.

The Catholic Church does not identify herself with any culture; her very essence prevents her from doing so. She is nevertheless prepared to maintain connections with all cultures. She recognises and allows to subsist in these anything which is not against nature. But into each of them she introduces, besides, the truth and the grace of Jesus Christ and thus confers on them a profound resemblance: it is also in this way that she contributes with the greatest efficacy, to procuring the peace of the world.

The entire world even today is undergoing the action of another element which one can predict will provoke in the history of humanity (in its profane aspects) considerable upsets: modern science and technique which Europe, or rather the Western countries have created during these last centuries; whoever does not assimilate them, it is said, is retrograde and will be eliminated; he who does assimilate them, on the contrary, must also consent to the dangers they involve "for human beings"-"für das Henschsein"/Jaspers etc. In fact, science and technique are on the way to becoming the common good of humanity. What causes anxiety are not only the dangers with which they menace the "human being", but the fact that they show themselves incapable of preventing the spiritual alienation that separates races and continents; this last seems on the contrary to be on the increase. If the catastrophy is to be avoided, it will be necessary, therefore, to set going at

the same time on a vast scale powerful religious and moral forces of unification and of achieving the common good of humanity. The Catholic Church is well aware that she possesses such forces, and she believes that she is no longer obliged to furnish historical proof. For the rest, where modern science and techniques are concerned she does not enclose herself within the opposition, but she rather acts as a counterweight and a balancing factor. Thus shall she be able, in that age in which science and technique triumph, to fulfill her task as well as she fulfilled it during the centuries that have passed.

* * *

It was Our desire to expound to you how the Church sees herself as a historical phenomenon, how she looks upon her task and her relations with other determined historical phenomena. With magnanimity, Our Predecessor Leo XIII threw open to scholars the Vatican Archives. Historians can there contemplate as in a mirror the awareness which the Church has of herself. You know that a single document can lead into error; but not a whole collection of archives, if, like those of the Vatican, with their considerable material covering the entire pontificates of decades and centuries, they place in evidence, through all the innumerable changes of events, of men and of situations, a clearly defined way of thought and of acting, determined convictions and principles. Thus are the Vatican Archives a testimony worthy of confidence of the conscience of the Catholic Church. Wishing moreover to respond to the desires of scholars, We are studying at present the opportune means to extend the action of Our Predecessor by rendering accessible the documents relating to a further period.

When he opened the Vatican Archives to the public, Leo XIII recalled the classical rule which the historian should observe, according to Cicero: "primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat: dein ne quid veri non audeat; ne qua suspicio gratiae sit scribendo, ne qua simultatis" /*De Oratore*/. You know how often discussion has taken place on the theme: "science should be free of presuppositions". This theme was a slogan; like all slogans it was not free from ambiguity and also gave rise to confusion. There does not exist a science, at least a positive science, which really ignores all presuppositions. Each one postulates at least certain laws of being and of thought, which it uses to form itself. If only instead of saying: "free from presuppositions", one had said "impartial"! May science in the pursuit of truth not allow itself to be influenced by subjective considerations—behold a proposition on which all should be able to meet in agreement.

That each one of you and the science which you pursue may contribute to make of the historical past a lesson for the present and the future We call down upon you with all Our heart the most abundant divine blessings.

A GROWING RIGIDITY AMONG THE FRENCH REFORMED ? A COMMENTARY

Catholics who work and pray for the realization of Christian unity have noted with a good deal of disappointment the message addressed to French Protestants by delegates attending the National Synod of the Reformed Church of France at Strasbourg during the first week of June. If each of the members of the World Council of Churches were to express itself with similar rigidity, we feel that the movement towards Christian unity would do doubt be considerably retarded. We should like to set forth here the content of that message and at the same time add whatever comments we deem necessary. The text followed is that published in the Ecumenical Press Service bulletin of June 24, 1955:

The word 'ecumenism' is understood today in different ways. Sometimes it denotes the proceedings of the Churches which have joined the World Council of Churches, in which the Roman Church refuses to participate. Sometimes it is used to describe meetings between Protestants and Catholics. Sometimes it expresses a certain indifference, which regards all the Christian confessions as equivalent.

Each of these defined meanings of ecumenism can be challenged without any real difficulty. Indeed, one cannot help but wonder at the omission of the official meaning of the term expressed on more than one occasion by the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft.[1] And above all, why pass over the natural meaning of the word which every Christian may accept and which connotes a movement towards Christian unity?

What definition, accordingly, would the Reformed Synod propose in order to "avoid misunderstanding"? It proposes none at all, except to make a Protestant profession of faith which would not even be Protestant unless one were to accompany each affirmation by an anti-Catholic negation (which we are adding in parentheses):

...we affirm that Jesus Christ is the sole Head of the Church (without a visible Vicar, without the Pope), the sole Redeemer (without any co-operation on the part of His Mother, the Virgin Mary), the sole Mediator and the sole dispenser of God's grace (without the priesthood, without efficacious Sacraments). The evangelical faith which we profess is based on Holy Scripture, in accordance with the inner witness of the Holy Spirit.

Nevertheless, the faithful are not left to Holy Scripture alone nor to the inner witness of the Holy Spirit, but after the manner of an infallible teacher the Synod goes on to give the following directives:

---

[1] "...that quality or attitude which expresses the consciousness of and desire for Christian unity." *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, London, 1954, p. 735.

1. We welcome the Biblical renewal which is taking place within the Catholic churches. This renewal does not mean, however, that that Church submits to the authority of the Bible in matters of faith.

This Biblical renewal is quite real. It is very laudable that it should continue to progress. Still, one must not exaggerate its novelty. In any case, the Catholic Church submits perfectly to Sacred Scripture in matters of faith; and it is, in fact, in Scripture that she finds the institution of the visible head of the Church (Matt. xvi, 16-19; John xxi, 15-17); the unique position of Mary (Luke i, 26-38; John xix, 25-27); the efficacy of the Sacraments (John iii, 3-10; vi, 51-53; xx, 21-23), etc. Just where would her resistance to Scripture be found?

2. At the same time, the experiments being made in the liturgical sphere may help to associate Christians more closely and more personally with the church-service, and increase their knowledge of the Bible. However, we still maintain firm reservations concerning the content of that service; we maintain especially our rejection of the Mass.

Worship finds its supreme expression in sacrifice. Would the worship established by Christ be less sublime than that of the Synagogue—or even than that of the pagans? Do not the institution of the Eucharist and the writings of St. Paul speak of sacrifice and therefore of the Mass?

3. Although the laity in the Catholic Church are trying to play a larger role in the witness of their Church, we affirm that this does not modify the Roman conception of the priesthood.

In the Catholic Church the laity is invited more than ever to collaborate with the apostolate of the hierarchy. But this fact does not supplant the priesthood which has been preserved and transmitted with all care since the time of the early Church. To this witness of the Catholic Church there is joined that of the Orthodox Churches and of Anglo-Catholic groups.

4. We are glad to find many Catholics who recognise the lay character of the State, and who desire it, for the good of the Church; but this does not relieve our anxiety with regard to the Roman Church's desire for power in the temporal sphere.

No Catholic defends the lay character of the State as an ideal. In certain cases, it is the lesser evil, that is all. Furthermore, the Catholic Church does not at all seek temporal domination. She strives to make her influence felt wherever spiritual interests are at stake. Apropos of this, is it not a fact that the President of the Reformed Church of France affixed his signature to declarations of the World Council which were framed with the purpose of influencing the political affairs of States?

5. Meetings between Catholics and Protestants for the purpose of study and meditation on the Bible seem to us to be possible; but they

must be undertaken with wisdom and discernment, bearing the preceding remarks in mind.

Wisdom surely ought not to be lacking at any time. A fruitful discussion, however, requires a certain open-mindedness among the participants. It would be surprising indeed if a receptive attitude were less possible among the defenders of freedom of judgment than among Catholic theologians with their solicitousness for right doctrine.

Particularly concerning the Week of Christian Unity, we remind the Reformed Church that it must pray for the unity of the Churches, remembering the prayer which Christ himself prayed. But we would also remind the Reformed Church that Catholics and Protestants can only truly pray together after sincerely explaining themselves to one another, so that there may be no weakening or distortion of the convictions of either side.

To my mind, this paragraph merits complete approval. We are all praying for Christian unity as it is willed by Christ. But it is evident that as long as we remain separated, each confession will determine that unity in its own fashion and will interpret the will of Christ from a different point of view.

These remarks and these reservations have no intention of criticising the personal attitude of many Catholic brethren, whose suffering and spiritual conflict we recognise; but we are forced to state our position clearly, because these brethren still insist on maintaining blind obedience to the authority of Rome.

This "suffering and spiritual conflict" has been caused by the separations brought about during the course of centuries contrary to the will of Christ and much to the unhappiness of souls; and this the present message does little or nothing to diminish. For my part I cannot help feeling justly proud to be considered, together with my confrères in the apostolate for unity, as "blindly obedient to the authority of Rome", alhough it would be more correct to substitute for the term "blindly" that of "faithfully" or "filially".

Our loyalty to the Church of Jesus Christ is shown by our faithfulness in the Reformed Church of France. We cannot accept the institutional authority of Rome; but in all humility we meet the men whom God places on our path, and agree to co-operate with them for the sole glory of Our Lord. For them, as for all men, we must pray and bear witness to our evangelical faith.

Mutual discussions, then, still remain possible; that is the important thing. We have enough confidence in the compelling force of truth not to despair of progress towards unity. Indeed, could anyone feel completely at ease when the claim is made that the Church of Jesus Christ has become the Reformed Church of France?

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA

In an earlier number of this volume of *Unitas,* there was a short notice on this same subject. It was written before the July meeting of the Convocations of the Church of England, to give a very brief history of the relations between the C. of E. and the Church of South India, in view of the controvery and tension within the Anglican body in their regard. For the 1948 Lambeth Conference had refrained from recognising the episcopal Orders of the C.S.I. owing to the opposition of a 'substantial minority', and the Convocations of July of this year were to reconsider the whole question and to decide afresh.

In the meantime within the C. of E. much had been written both for and against closer relations with the C.S.I., and on the whole the party in favour had grown in strength. At one time it seemed not unlikely that its supporters would urge Convocations to establish full intercommunion between the two Churches. In the event, however, the proposals made were only that the bishops of the C.S.I. and its episcopally-ordained 'presbyters' should be recognised as true bishops and ordained ministers of the Universal Church, and that its laity should be allowed to communicate freely in Anglican churches. The Convocations of Canterbury and York accepted these measures without difficulty. The out-and-out advocates of the C.S.I. are no doubt disappointed that so little was effected: the spiritual successors of the 'substantial minority' must on the whole have experienced a sense of relief that not more was demanded. So there is 'peace in our day'.

But there is no doubt that the controversy about the C.S.I. caused a great deal of unrest within the Anglican body and much self-questioning, which this decision of Convocations will not altogether have dispelled. There was at an earlier stage talk of mass-defections from Anglicanism, but that is totally contrary to the Anglican spirit of comprehensiveness and was not taken very seriously by those most acquainted with its history and thought. For one thing, those Anglicans who could have been most expected to have headed such a movement, members of associations for corporate reunion with Rome, had already shown that they were unprepared for so drastic a step. Their campaigning days would seem to be finished. They seem to have settled down to a quiet acceptance of the *status quo.* Their attitude now is rather: We have done our part; we believe in Catholic doctrine including the papacy; there is nothing more we can do; it is now up to Rome to take the next step. As the 'next step' to be forthcoming from Rome is, in their view, the recognition of their Orders and Sacraments, things have come to an impasse, and there is a general quiescence.

The decision of the Convocations to recognise the episcopal Orders of the C.S.I., though in 1948 the same proposal drove a "substantial minority' of the Lambeth Conference to vigorous opposition, has on

the whole not greatly disturbed them. Rather it has reassured them, as the alternative—intercommunion—was so much more radical, and the fact that their authorities chose the lesser of the two 'evils' is taken as a sign of fundamental orthodoxy in their Church. In any case the Ordinal of the C.S.I. is in all essentials the same as that of the C. of E. and so in their estimation wholly acceptable. The doubts expressed in 1948 about the faith of the new Church, which were alleged to warrant the refusal to acknowledge C.S.I. Orders then, have by now, they may think, been largely dispelled. The alternative to acquiescing in the vote of the Convocations would have been growing division in the C. of E.

In point of fact, it is not so much the decision of the Convocations that ought to have seriously upset the more Catholic elements of the C. of E. (that decision was inevitable from the start and foreseeable long ago), as the attitude of mind disclosed in their co-religionists in the course of the controversy. The Constitutions of the C.S.I., though they accept the office of bishop, assert and reassert both the impossibility of settling any doctrine of the episcopacy and the complete freedom of its members to hold any interpretation they like about it. It is, of course, true that in the C. of E. various interpretations of it are *de facto* held, and in this respect the C.S.I. is no worse and no better than the C. of E. But, whereas, the Constitutions of the C.S.I. proclaim this as its official policy, the Prayer Book and particularly the Ordinal of the C. of E., in the view of the more Catholic elements of Anglicanism, exhibit Catholic doctrine, that episcopacy is of divine origin and the priesthood is a sacrificing priesthood, i.e., a definite teaching on Orders in harmony with that of the Church through the ages, and of necessary belief. The whole claim of the Anglo-Catholic to valid Orders, as he views them, rests on that conviction, which he holds against the incredulity of many of his fellow-Anglicans and the firm rejection by the Church of Rome. More, he maintains, and must maintain, that his view is the genuine and traditional teaching of his Church from the beginning (and especially in the beginning), and that it has been preserved throughout its history. If other opinions have been and are found, they are not true Anglicanism, but the aberrations of individuals divorced from the origin and genuine Anglican faith. The formularies of the ordination ceremonies are to be interpreted in the light of his version of Anglican traditional teaching and no other. In that case, and not otherwise, they can, he believes, and do, convey true Orders.

The late controversy and the decision of Convocations have shown at least this, that the majority of Anglicans today and their bishops do not believe that the C. of E. adheres to any one interpretation of the theology of Orders. The aim of the writers in favour of closer relations with the C.S.I. has been to show that the C. of E. never has adhered to any one interpretation of the theology of Orders, and so, that the conviction of their Anglican opponents that it has is histori-

cally unfounded and erroneous. The vote of Convocations recognising the episcopal ordinations of the C.S.I., where it is a formulated principle that no fixed interpretation can be imposed or demanded, as equivalent to Anglican Ordinations, means that the bishops of the Anglican Church and a representative body of the Lower Clergy concur in that formulated principle, admit the cogency of the arguments of the supporters of the C.S.I. within the C. of E., and reject the view that its Anglican opponents claim to be the only admissable Anglican tradition. The very foundation of the Anglo-Catholics' security in their Orders had been challenged by the highest authority of their Church, Convocations.

This fact is and ought to be disquieting. If the more liberal Anglicans are right, that the C. of E. has never had a clear and fixed theology of Orders (the Catholic Church says that in its beginning it had one fixed point at least—the rejection of a sacrificing priesthood), what did its first bishops intend to do when consecrating and ordaining, and what did its formularies really mean? As now the bishops in Convocation have shown that the C. of E. has no clear and fixed theology of Orders, what are they supposed to be doing when in ordinations they use formulae so vague and elastic?

Those among Anglicans who hope for corporate reunion with Rome assert that the only obstacle to their adherence to the Church which they acknowledge as the only Church of Christ endowed with infallibility of teaching through the abiding presence in it of the Holy Spirit is the non-recognition of their Orders. They would, they say, have to deny truth to embrace truth. This conviction of theirs ought to have been shaken by recent events. But even if it has not, even if on historical grounds and from intricate arguments on the difficult doctrine of intention they think they can still defend their Orders, yet the Church which they admit to be the infallible guide of faith and morals has decided against them; and that fact, even though they may not be altogether convinced by the reasoning that lay behind the Roman decision, should instill doubt into their minds as to whether they are after all right. Then their hesitant conviction could be engulfed in a wholehearted acceptance of the authority of Christ's Church.

J. GILL, S.J.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Central Committee of the World Council of Churches Meets at Davos

The important Central Committee of the W.C.C. met for its annual sessions at Davos, Switzerland, from August 2 to 9. The Committee, which is composed of ninety members, is the governing body of the World Council and comes together every year for a special meeting. At Davos the members of the Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, considered two principal themes: "Various meanings of Christian unity and the unity which the World Council of Churches seeks to promote" and "Implications of Christian unity for Inter-Church aid and for assistance to underdeveloped countries". Among other subjects that came under consideration were: proselytism and religious liberty, the question of disarmament, and a report of the activities of the World Council since the Evanston Assembly held last August.

The theme of the various meanings of Christian unity was presented to the Central Committee by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council. In his presentation, Dr. Visser 't Hooft made it clear that the World Council does not hold to any specific doctrine concerning the nature of church unity. This, he implied, was made necessary by the very nature of things since many different concepts of Christian unity were to be found among the individual member churches of the Council. The task of the latter, according to the General Secretary, was not to advocate the adoption of any particular concept of unity but to make the various members of the Council all feel at home within it despite their divergences.[1]

In his address, the General Secretary said further that "it belongs to the very nature of the ecumenical encounter which the Council seeks to promote that it holds the door open for every church which, accepting the basis of the World Council, is willing to consider with other churches, how the unity of the Church of Christ may be realized".

Together with other officials of the different committees of the World Council, Dr. Robert Nelson submitted a report in his capacity of Secretary for the Commission on Faith and Order. In presenting an account of the Commission's work, Dr. Nelson stressed the value to the Council in possessing "one group which, with singular attentiveness,

---

[1] Dr. Visser 't Hooft is right: the World Council does not and cannot have an explicit definition of the unity of the Church. Nevertheless, the very existence and the activity of the Council do in fact suppose one which is precise enough to be judged right or wrong. All of the official documents suppose that the Churches of the Council belong to the Church of Christ which is proclaimed one. There is postulated a unity of the Churches, therefore, which can subsist together with confessional divergences. The Catholic Church, however, quite understandably, declares this conception wrong (as do also the Orthodox). (Editor's note)

concentrates on the numerous problems created by our confessional, institutional estrangements one from another". As evidence of what the Faith and Order Commission was doing in this regard, Dr. Nelson stated that theological commissions made up of members from seventeen countries were exploring questions like the following:

1. What is the nature of the Church in the light of the doctrines of Christ and the Holy Spirit?

2. How, in the diversity of ways and meaning of worship can we help one another more truly to adore God, and to find our unity in such adoration?

3. What are the single tradition and common history of all churches, and how do our separate traditions and histories perpetuate divisions?

4. How can we of the World Council of Churches deal with the distressing and elusive problem of proselytism?

5. How is our inevitable and seemingly inextricable involvement in ecclesiastical institutions, with all the temptations of bureaucracy and denominational aggrandizement, militating against the manifestation of the oneness of the Church of Him whom men crucified in order to defend their institutions?

The members of the Central Committee were informed that these questions would form the nucleus of the task of the Faith and Order Commission for the next five years.

Another item of interest at Davos was the announcement that two more applications for membership in the World Council were approved by the Central Committee. These two new member Churches are the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Silesia with a membership of about 50,000 and the National Baptist Convention of America which claims some 2,600,000 adherents. *(EPS)*

* * *

Church of England Convocations Vote Intercommunion with Church of South India

The Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York, the supreme governing bodies of the Church of England whose periodic meetings are termed Convocation, met for important sessions during the first week of July. Primary among the subjects on the agenda was the question of intercommunion with the Church of South India. Joint committees had been appointed some time ago by both Synods to draw up a report concerning relations with the Church of South India and to frame resolutions in its regard for Convocation. Dr. G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester, was elected to serve as chairman for the Canterbury committee, while Dr. Michael Ramsey, Bishop of Durham, chaired that of York.

In presenting the Report on relations with the CSI, Dr. Bell told the members of Convocation at Canterbury that up to the present judgment had been deferred on two important matters affecting relations with the newly organized Church. The first of these had reference to the validity of ordinations in the Church of South India, and the second concerned permission to its clergymen to conduct services in England's Anglican churches. Dr. Bell said that now the Church of England was ready to declare its mind on these two points, and favourably so. He declared that as far as the joint committees were concerned, their members had voted unanimously to accept the ordinations of the bishops, presbyters, and deacons of the CSI as valid. Accordingly, it did not seem right for Convocation to postpone its decision any longer.

The presentation of the Report did not stir up the lively debate that had been anticipated, especially in view of the pros and cons expressed on the matter in newspapers and periodicals over the last several months preceding Convocations. A vigorous Anglo-Catholic minority had been expected to voice its strong opposition to intercommunion with the CSI, but this did not turn out to be the case. Instead, the resolutions of the joint committee were carried practically unanimously by the Upper and Lower Houses of Canterbury.

The Convocation of York, meeting at the same time, also approved the recommendations of its joint committee.

The resolutions affecting the Church of South India were published in the *Church Times* in the following summary form:

"1. That this House, while appreciating the difficulties which have hitherto stood in the way of a unanimous decision, is now agreed, both on theological grounds and in the light of the further development of the Church of South India, that it is no longer necessary to postpone a definite judgment concerning the status of the bishops, presbyters and deacons consecrated or ordained in the Church of South India at, or after, the inauguration of that Church, and acknowledges such bishops, presbyters and deacons as true bishops, priests and deacons in the Church of God.

"2. That this House further resolves that:

(a) Members of the Church of South India who are communicants in that Church may, when in England, receive Holy Communion in the Church of England.

(b) Members of the Church of South India who become permanently resident in England, and desire to be habitual communicants in the Church of England, shall be required to conform to the regular discipline of the Church of England.

(c) Bishops, presbyters and deacons of the Church of South India may be invited to preach in churches of the Church

of England with the permission of the bishop of the diocese.

(d) Any bishop or episcopally ordained presbyter of the Church of South India may be free to celebrate the Holy Communion in a church of the Church of England at the invitation of the incumbent, with the permission of the bishop of the diocese, subject to his willingness, while in England, to celebrate in Anglican churches only, and where these apply, to the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act.[2]

(e) The bishop of a diocese may, at his discretion, authorize the loan of a parish church in his diocese, from time to time, for the celebration of the liturgy of the Church of South India by a bishop or episcopally ordained presbyter of that Church.

(f) A bishop or episcopally ordained presbyter or deacon of the Church of South India who desires to officiate as a bishop, priest or deacon of the Church of England, whether for a limited period or permanently, may be allowed to do so, provided that he has received such permission as may be required under the Colonial Clergy Act. Such bishop, presbyter or deacon becomes subject in all respects to the rules and regulations of the Church of England.

(g) Other ministers of the Church of South India who desire to enter the ministry of the Church of England shall be subject to its rules and regulations regarding admission to its ministry.

(h) Bishops and priests of the Church of England who visit the territory of the Church of South India may accept the hospitality of that Church for celebrating the Holy Communion within it.

(i) Members of the Church of England who visit the territory of the Church of South India may accept the hospitality of that Church for receiving the Holy Communion within it.

"3. That this House respectfully requests his Grace the President to take appropriate action to give effect to the recommendations contained in this Report concerning practical help for the Church of South

---

[2] This Act dates from 1874. According to Dr. Bell, "The Act lays it down that no person ordained priest or deacon by any bishop, other than a bishop of a diocese in Church of England, may officiate in a Church of England church without the permission in writing of the Archbishop of the Province, without subscribing to the Declaration of Assent, and without promising that, while ministering in England, in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, he will use the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority".

India, and in view of the paramount importance of prayer, to take special steps, through whatever agencies he prefers, to ensure persistent and informed prayer for that Church".

* * *

The Church of England and Relations with the Methodists

Besides the Report dealing with the Church of South India, Convocations also considered another Report concerning church relations in England, and more specifically with the Methodist Church. At Canterbury this latter Report was presented to the synod by the Bishop of London, Dr. Wand, and by the Reverend H. Riley, while at York it was introduced to the delegates by the Bishop of Liverpool.

Overtures to the Methodists and other Free Churches in England had been given further impetus in 1946 following a sermon by the Archbishop of Canterbury in which he urged those Churches to "take episcopacy into their systems". In the negotiations for reunion which have been carried on since that time, the matter of the episcopate has become more of a central issue, and this fact was quite evident in both the Report dealing with the Methodists and in the discussions it occasioned both at Canterbury and York.

The Report itself was based upon certain stipulations made by the Faith and Order Committee of the Methodist Church in England in a statement envisioning closer relations with the Anglican Church. Among the more important of the stipulations were these:

1. That the Church of England acknowledge that "our divisions are within the Christian Body which is throughout in a state of schism".

2. That "the same liberty of interpretation of the nature of episcopacy and of the priesthood would be accorded to the Methodist Church as prevails in the Church of England".

3. That "the Methodist Church would be free to preserve the relations of intercommunion and fellowship with other non-episcopal Churches which it now enjoys".

In confronting these stipulations, the Report declares that it prefers to avoid the use of term 'schism' because of its theological ambiguities, but "would regard all discussions between the Methodist Church and the Church of England as taking place within the Body of Christ". It would also allow the Methodists both liberty and limitation in interpreting the nature of the episcopate as long as this was in keeping with the formularies and practice of the Church of England which reflect both positive statement and absence of exact definition. As for the freedom of the Methodist Church to continue its intercommunion with other Free Churches, this offered more of a difficulty, but it was not "an insuperable barrier to fruitful discussions" with it.

In the course of the debate in Convocations on the Report, concern was expressed about Methodist insistence on continued intercommunion with other Protestant groups and about the views of that Church regarding Confirmation. Some delegates also saw the danger of two possible parallel episcopal Churches in England and pressed for the assurance that this would be avoided by linking any future Methodist episcopate from the start with that of the Church of England. Still others wanted to be sure that the episcopate would not be divested by the Methodists of its sacramental character and looked upon merely as an administrative medium.

At the end of the debate Convocations voted their consent to the recommendation of the joint committees presenting the Report that the Primates of Canterbury and York begin conversations with the Methodists with a view to exploring ways and means of reaching agreement on the different points at issue between the two Churches.

(Church Times)

* * *

Merger Plans for Two American Denominations

At a recent meeting in Columbus, Ohio, of the authorities of the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church, final steps were taken towards the eventual merger of these denominations into a new body to be known as the United Church of Christ. It was decided that the date of the merger is to be June 25, 1957. The new denomination will claim over 2,000,000 members, 1,263,000 of whom now belong to the Congregational group and 775,000 to the Evangelical Reformed Church.

This agreement is the result of negotiations between these two groups which have been carried on since before 1948. In that year a union plan had been drafted but could not be realized because of a litigation brought against it by the Cadman Memorial Church of Brooklyn. Developments since that time, however, have made it possible for the denominations to go ahead with their original plan. Until the actual merger takes place, joint activities in education, social action, etc. will continue to be regularly sponsored by these bodies. *(EPS)*

* * *

The American Church Union and the Church of South India

Meeting at Valley Forge early in July for its annual convention the clerical section of the American Church Union—an Episcopalian organization—released a statement for publication in which it declared its opposition to intercommunion with the Church of South India. The group based its stand primarily on doctrinal grounds and charged that that Church had not given sufficient proof of its orthodoxy. The declaration also deplored the suggestion of Anglican intercommunion

with a Church in which some of the clergy were not episcopally ordained. The following are some of the salient points of the statement:

"We stand unalterably opposed to any efforts to extend intercommunion or recognition to a Church which lays open to question our Lord's Virgin Birth and His Bodily Resurrection or any other article of the Universal Creed of Christendom. It is not possible to remain true to the clear teaching of the preface to our own Ordinal and, at the same time, allow intercommunion with a Church where some clergy are not episcopally ordained. We hope and pray that the ex-Anglicans and others who have formed the Church of South India will grow into the full faith of the Catholic Church, and are glad to see some signs pointing in this direction. On the other hand, as long as the Church of South India has a mixed ministry, partly episcopally ordained and partly not, and dangerously qualifies its allegiance to the historic faith and order of the Church Catholic, intercommunion is impossible".

"We earnestly need and desire the unity of all Christians, for which our Lord prayed—a unity in the truth; and we earnestly and lovingly pray for our brethren of the Church of South India. However, intercommunion and recognition of the ministry of a Church which leaves its adherence to the fundamental faith of Christendom in doubt is surely not unity in the truth, nor is it Christian charity. Moreover, we deplore the pressure that has been exercised on those South Indians who wish to remain loyal to Anglican principles; the Church of South India claims that it has no particular view of the episcopate, but it certainly acts on a definite view; that though convenient it is not essential.

"We should regret the extension of the South India precedent to other areas, since experience shows that the historic Catholic principles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral have been dangerously weakened in the South India experiment—the apostolic priesthood is obscured, the creeds left uncertain, the administration of the sacraments doubtful, and the Bible appealed to individualistically rather than as the Church's Book. Valid orders are not all that is needed for intercommunion; the question of orthodoxy is vital. For India or for any other country the fullness of faith is needed to meet the needs of man, and it is on this basis that we hope that intercommunion with the Church of South India will, in time, be possible".

* * *

Doctorate in Ecumenical Studies

The Ecumenical Press Service reports that a Doctorate in Ecumenical Studies has been granted for the first time. The degree was conferred upon Mr. Hellmut Rosin of Berne on July 1 by the Faculty of Theology

of Geneva University in conjunction with the Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies at Bossey. Among those present for Mr. Rosin's defense of his thesis were Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Dr. Jaques Courvoisier-Patry, Dean of the Faculty of Theology of the University.

THE VISIBILITY OF CHRIST'S CHURCH

They, therefore, who profess themselves Christians cannot, we think, but believe in Christ's establishment of one Church and only one. Yet when one asks what that church ought by the will of its Founder to be, then not all agree. Indeed a great many deny, for example, that Christ's Church ought to be visible; at least in the sense that it should stand forth as one body of faithful united in one identical doctrine and under one authority and rule. On the contrary they understand by a visible Church nothing but a society formed of various Christian communities even though these adhere to different and even mutually contradictory doctrines.

Instead Christ Our Lord founded His Church a perfect society, external of its own nature and perceived by the senses, which would persue for all future time the task of saving mankind through the guidance of one head, through being taught by a living voice, and through the dispensation of the Sacraments, as fountains of the grace of Heaven. Wherefore, He likened His Church to a kingdom, to a house, to a sheepfold, to a flock.

Pope Pius XI - *Mortalium Animos*

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Pope Pius Inaugurates International Thomistic Congress

With His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, present to deliver the opening address, the Fourth International Thomistic Congress was held in Rome from September 13th to the 17th. The scholarly gathering was sponsored by the Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas and devoted its sessions mainly to the comparison of the great Dominican's teachings with the present state of the physical sciences, with Hegelian and Marxist philosophy, and with the problems connected with Existentialism.

The Academy of St. Thomas owes its foundation to Pope Leo XIII who launched its activity in 1879 shortly after the publication of his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* in which he appealed for the renascence of the thought and teachings of the Angelic Doctor. The Academy held its first international congress in 1925 and the second in 1936, while the third took place in 1950 subsequent to the appearance of the present Pope's encyclical *Humani Generis*. At that time the delegates in attendance based their papers and discussions on the principal theme of the encyclical which dealt with the harmony between faith and reason.

In his address to the delegates of this year's congress who represented over seventy faculties and universities from twenty-five different countries, the Holy Father said: "We wish to note at once, in general, that the study, honest and profound, of scientific problems not only does not lead of itself to conflicts with the certain principles of perennial philosophy, but from it receives a light that even the philosophers themselves perhaps did not foresee; nor even could they hope for it to be so continued and intense". The Pope then proceeded to relate the principles of St. Thomas's philosophy to the development of modern physics and showed how there was actually a new affinity between the conceptions of science and those of philosophy. In conclusion the Holy Father affirmed that despite new scientific discoveries and the inadequateness of former experimental methods, scientific data have undergone no alteration, while philosophical premises continue to maintain their value.

World Congress of Historians Convenes in Rome

A convention of unusual interest took place in the Eternal City in the early part of September when 1500 historians from many different countries came together for another international meeting. This was the Tenth Congress of Historical Sciences, the sessions of which were held in the Palazzo dei Congressi situated on the Exposition grounds of Rome. In all, the work of the Congress was carried on over a period

of approximately eight days, from September 4th to September 11th, and covered a variety of historical themes.

A major event during the proceedings of the Congress was a papal audience for the delegates at the Vatican in which Pope Pius delivered an address on the Church as a fact of history.[1] Among the points the Pope discussed were: Church and State, religious liberty, and the Church and culture. Towards the end of his address, the Holy Father revealed that steps were being taken to make more of the Vatican documents accessible to scholars in the field of history. In this he said he was following the lead of Leo XIII who had opened the Vatican archives to scholars some seventy-five years ago. "There," said the Pope, "historians can contemplate, as in a mirror, the knowledge that the Church has of herself." *(Oss. Romano)*

A Statement of the Holy Office on the MRA

A statement of the Holy Office relative to the Moral Rearmament Movement was recently made public in view of recent developments affecting that organization. The declaration was originally issued in August 1951 when it was sent to Catholic bishops throughout the world to serve as a norm with respect to Catholic participation in the MRA. Because this participation has still continued and is looked upon by the Holy Office as misguided and compromising, it was decided to release the text of the original letter to the members of the hierarchy. The directives from Rome were given as follows:

"The Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office has been asked whether it is fitting that the clergy and members of religious communities should take part in reunions and meetings of Moral Rearmament.

"Their Eminences the Cardinals and the priests of this Sacred Congregation, in a plenary session on August 8, 1951, attentively examined the proposed question and decided to issue the following directives:

"1. It is not fitting for either diocesan or religious priests, and much less for nuns, to participate in the meetings of Moral Rearmament.

"2. If exceptional circumstances should make such a participation opportune, the permission of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office must be requested beforehand. This permission will be granted only to learned and experienced priests.

"3. Finally, it is not fitting that the faithful should accept positions of responsibility in Moral Rearmament, and especially not fitting that they should join the so-called 'policy team'."

In this connection the London *Tablet* quotes passages from a letter by Cardinal Pizzardo, Secretary of the Holy Office, in which he laments

---

[1] A translation of this elocution appears elsewhere in this issue.

the fact that Catholics should be "seeking certain moral and social objectives, however praiseworthy they may be, in the bosom of a movement which possesses neither the patrimony of doctrine and of spiritual life, nor the supernatural means of grace, which the Catholic Church has".

"The danger of syncretism and of religious indifference", continued the Cardinal, "of which warnings have been given in connection with Moral Rearmament, can no longer be ignored".

* * *

THE UNITED STATES

Byzantine Liturgy Sung in English

An event which was unique in the history of the Church in the United States took place in Uniontown, Pa. on September 5th when Auxiliary Bishop Fulton J. Sheen of New York offered the first pontifical Mass ever to be sung in English. By special permission of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church, granted through its secretary, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, it was made possible for Bishop Sheen to offer the Mass in the Byzantine Rite in English to climax an annual pilgrimage of members of the Greek Rite diocese of Pittsburgh. The pilgrimage was made to the Shrine of Our Lady of Perpetual Help at the Convent of the Sisters of St. Basil the Great and had as its intention prayers for the conversion of Russia.

While almost all of the liturgy was sung in English by both the celebrant and choir, the words of Consecration and several of the doxologies were sung in Old Slavonic. As celebrant, Bishop Sheen also wore Eastern vestments together with the traditional Byzantine Crown.

Preaching at the Mass, the Bishop told of the Church's solicitude for Russia and recalled the Blessed Virgin Mary's interest in the Russian people and of her traditional place of honor among them.

It was announced later that the entire ceremony was broadcast to those behind the Iron Curtain by the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. *(NC)*

Centennial Celebration for Benedictine Archabbey

St. Vincent's Archabbey in Latrobe, Pa., a monastery of the American Cassinese Congregation of the Benedictine Order, celebrated the hundredth anniversary of its rank during the latter part of August. Founded as a priory in 1846 by Archabbot Boniface Wimmer, the monastery was elevated to the position of an abbey by Pope Pius IX in 1855.

It was Archabbot Wimmer who began the American Cassinese Congregation of Benedictines at Latrobe in August 1846. Today the Congregation, which is headed by the Rev. Denis Strittmatter, O.S.B., Archabbot of St. Vincent's, claims the largest membership of any Bene-

dictine branch. At the present time, the Congregation numbers 1878 religious, 1189 of whom are priests. They staff sixteen abbeys and fourteen colleges in the United States and Canada, as well as serving as missioners in the Bahamas, Mexico, and Japan. *(NC)*

First Independent Priory for Benedictines of Byzantine Rite

By a decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church, a priory of Benedictine monks of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite in the United States has been raised to an independent status. This is the Holy Trinity Priory of Pittsburgh which was founded in 1948 by Abbot Ambrose Ondrak, O.S.B., of St. Procopius's Abbey in Lisle, Illinois. Both of these communities belong to the American Cassinese Congregation of the Benedictines.

The members of Holy Trinity Priory form the first independent Benedictine group of the Byzantine-Slavonic Rite. Their liturgy and Divine Office will henceforth be celebrated according to that rite, while canonical legislation governing their religious life will derive from the Code of canon law for the Eastern Church. *(SICO)*

Episcopalians Vote Retention of Name

For the first time in its history, the fifty-eighth general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was held outside of the continental United States. Under the presidency of Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill, the 1500 clerical and lay delegates to the convention met for their discussions in Honolulu during the first two weeks of September. There they considered the present state of their Church, as well as debating such subjects as: Church union, pastoral problems in industrial areas, marriage and divorce, alcoholism, and the question of modifying the official name of their denomination.

According to the *New York Times,* the latter issue occasioned a lively debate between two opposing blocs at the convention. Those of one group favored the dropping of the term "Protestant" from the name of their Church since they held that Protestantism was but incidental to its "fundamental Catholicity". They claimed also that their denomination is nearly always referred to as the Episcopal Church, a term which distinguished it from both the Catholic Church and different Protestant bodies.

The other bloc, however, argued that the term "Protestant" should be retained since its Church was closely linked to the heritage of the Reformation. A further argument advanced for its retention was that the Episcopal Church was a happy blend of both Protestant and Catholic traditions.

In the vote following the debate, the group rejecting the change of name prevailed by a count of 89 to 55, the final tabulation being proportional rather than individual.

At the close of the convention, the Bishops of the Episcopal Church issued a joint pastoral letter in which the role of Asia in the fate of the world was the dominant theme. They pointed out that its evangelization presented a distinct challenge and that upon its outcome would depend in large measure the future of mankind.

Melchite Patriarch Visits the United States

The leader of the Byzantine-Melchite Church, Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh of Antioch, Syria, visited Boston in August as the guest of Archbishop Richard J. Cushing. He is the first Melchite patriarch ever to visit the United States.

During his stay in Boston, the Patriarch was awarded an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by Boston College at the inauguration of the Archdiocesan Teachers' Institute. At the solemn pontifical Mass opening the Institute, Archbishop Cushing was both celebrant and preacher.

In his sermon, the Archbishop paid tribute to the unity in diversity as an exclusive feature of the Catholic Church, and asked for prayers that dissident Eastern Christians might be reunited with the Holy See.

"The members of the Orthodox Churches", Archbishop Cushing said, "share with us the profound desire that the once-treasured unity of Christendom be regained. In God's good time and in His way this will surely be accomplished".

Patriarch Maximos IV has jurisdiction over some 375,000 Melchites in Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, America, and in other parts of the world. There are approximately 50,000 in the United States, with 1,600 of these residing in the Boston area. *(Boston Pilot)*

* * *

ENGLAND

Pax Romana Meets at Nottingham

Students and professors from forty-three different countries travelled to Nottingham in August to take part in the twenty-third world congress of Pax Romana, an international federation of Catholic university students. The theme chosen for the convention was: "From University to Life: Problems of the Young Graduate".

The principal addresses at the inaugural academic session on August 18 were given by Sir Hugh Stott Taylor of Princeton University, president of the graduate branch, and by Dr. Joseph Kuriacose of India, president of the student branch.

Following the opening addresses, the delegates were subdivided into commissions and study groups in which, over a period of six days, they debated the role of university students in business and the professions,

their cultural, ethical, and religious development, social responsibilities, and the role of women with degrees.

In his letter of welcome to the delegates, Cardinal Griffin of Westminster wrote: "In some ways we may regard Pax Romana as the Catholic equivalent of Unesco—the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation. But over and above this, Pax Romana has a programme of its own—to encourage its members to do all in their power to maintain and extend our Christian civilisation. It seeks to implement the desire of the Holy Father expressed in his message to the Amsterdam congress in 1950: the permeation of contemporary thought, and the service to the Church".

Later Cardinal Griffin, who is president of the Catholic university movement in Britain, presided at a solemn pontifical Mass at Westminster Cathedral where the delegates assembled for the closing of the congress.

Among the number of interesting addresses at Nottingham, two of the more noteworthy were those of Bishop Beck of Brentwood who spoke on the "Life of Faith", and of Msgr. Gordon Wheeler whose topic was: "Catholicism in Britain". *(C. Herald)*

Prominent Anglican Leader Enters Catholic Church

In consequence of the decision of Convocations to establish intercommunion with the Church of South India, one of the best known Anglo-Catholic leaders in England has been received recently into the Catholic Church. He is Mr. Walton Hannah, who until September had served as secretary to the Annunciation Group, a High Church organization of some 2000 Anglican clergymen. He is also known as "Pastor Anglicanus", the initiator of this year's celebrated correspondence on Anglo-Roman Catholic relations in the London *Tablet.*

In a public statement explaining his step, Mr. Hannah declared in part: "Recent events in South India and elsewhere have shown me clearly that the Church of England cannot make any claim to be a 'branch' of the Catholic Church in separation from the divinely-appointed centre of unity".

"In South India there is but a loose acceptance of two of the historic creeds of Christendom, and a rejection of the third. Yet it is on these ecumenical lines that the Church of England is moving in this twentieth century, departing yet further from the faith of her Catholic past before her rupture from Catholic unity".

"There have been exaggerated reports, but to my certain knowledge, there are other Anglican clergy who are taking the step that I am taking, and I doubt not that more will follow.

"Disillusionment with Anglicanism is no substitute for faith in the Catholic Church which is a gift of God. But it may well be the first step". *(The Tablet)*

Pilgrims to Walsingham Pray for Unity

Approximately 3000 persons took part in August in a national pilgrimage to the Shrine of Our Lady at Walsingham. An interesting feature of the pilgrimage was the fact that its focal point was prayer for Christian unity.

During the all-night vigil preceding the event, one group of pilgrims dedicated the recitation of the Rosary to the accomplishment of unity. The group also followed the hourly meditations conducted by Fr. Edmund Jones of the Olivetan Benedictines who presented various aspects of Christian unity and related the Rosary intentions to those Christians and non-Christians who are separated from the Catholic Church.

On the day of the pilgrimage itself, Bishop Parker of Northampton celebrated the pontifical high Mass for the intention of unity and spoke of Our Lady's role in its eventual accomplishment.

The ceremonies of the day came to a close with an afternoon procession to the Slipper Chapel of Walsingham where solemn Benediction was imparted to the pilgrims who had come from many different parts of England. *(C. Herald)*

* * *

GERMANY

Augsburg Celebrates Millenium of Great Victory

From July 3rd to July 10th, the city of Augsburg sponsored week-long festivities to commemorate the triumph of the Christians of the West over the pagan forces of the Hungarian invaders.[2] This occurred at the historic Battle of Lech on August 10, 955, when the grave threat to Western Christendom was averted under the victorious leadership of Otto the Great and St. Ulrich, then bishop of Augusta (later Augsburg). The significance of the victory was such that it is comparable to that of Charles Martel over the Moslems at the Battle of Tours in 732.

To honor the memory of the heroic bishop of Augusta, who has been called "Saviour of the Christian West", the festival program was designated as the "Week of St. Ulrich".

The Augsburg celebration reached its climax on July 10 when 80,000 people gathered in Rosenau Stadium for the concluding ceremonies. For these, Cardinal Gracias of Bombay was present as guest of honor.

To mark the event Pope Pius sent its participants a letter of felicitation in which he emphasized the importance of the victory at Lech for the Christian West. He also took occasion to recall another cen-

---

2 A few decades after this defeat, the young Hungarian nation was won over to Christianity largely through the efforts of St. Stephen, the first king of Hungary, and itself later became a bulwark against other pagan invasions.

tenary which falls this year—that of the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. This he termed a decisive factor in the "break-up of religious unity in Germany and in Europe . . . and the most telling blow that could have been struck against the Christian West and its civilization".

"With that period in mind", continued the Holy Father, "might We not express the hope that the way indicated to the West by Divine Providence is that which leads ever closer to that lost unity? In respect to the West, we cannot but restate here . . . 'it (the Occident) will be either genuinely Christian and Catholic, or else it will be destroyed by the devastating fire of that other culture for which matter and physical energy are the only reality'." *(Oss. de Genève)*

* * *

JAPAN

Late Catholic Statistics

Catholics in Japan today number 212,321, according to the official statistics issued recently by the Apostolic Internunciature in Tokyo. This figure represents an increase of 48 per cent as compared with the number of Japanese Catholics in 1950 which was then 141,638.

The number of adult converts to the faith for 1954 was 10,945, while the catechumens presently under instruction are estimated as being 17,000.

Priests working in Japan now number 1,226. Making up this figure are 279 Japanese priests and 947 foreign priests belonging for the most part to various missionary societies.

It is interesting to note that Japan has 2,518 native and 1,019 foreign sisters and no less than 1,273 Japanese novices and postulants. In relation to the over-all total of Japanese adult Catholic women, these figures are very high, for they reveal that almost five per cent of the country's Catholic women have entered the religious life—perhaps the highest ratio in the world. *(NC)*

* * *

BRAZIL

International Eucharistic Congress at Rio de Janeiro

Catholics from over fifty nations assembled in Rio de Janeiro during the latter part of July to participate in the 36th International Eucharistic Congress. In the superb setting provided by the city, well attended ceremonies carried on over a full week, together with other appropriate demonstrations, reflected the unity of faith among Catholics and their fidelity to the Holy Eucharist. An instance of this could be seen from one of the ceremonies in which an estimated 250,000 children received Holy Communion, having as their intention "the salvation of the world".

Besides great numbers of the faithful, twenty-two cardinals and some three hundred archbishops and bishops were present at the Congress. Cardinal Aloisi Masella of Rome served as Papal Legate.

In a radio address delivered in Portuguese, the Holy Father told his listeners: "In the Eucharist you have found the greatest energy to spread Christianity and to insure with memorable actions the integrity of the nation and the unity of faith".

"The Mystery of unity", continued the Pope, "by incorporating and almost identifying the faithful with Christ, tends to unite them into one single family and one sole body in which beats one heart alone, one soul alone, and in which each member is as zealous of the well-being of others as of his own, and even more so".

The Eucharistic Congress was brought to a splendid close on July 24 by a colorful procession of the Blessed Sacrament which lasted for two hours, originating at the Candeleria Church and ending at Congress Square. *(RNS)*

Latin American Bishops Stress Harm Done by Proselytism

At a general conference of Latin American bishops which was held in Rio de Janeiro following the Eucharistic Congress, one of the principal problems that came up for consideration was the serious one of Protestant proselytism. The conclusion that the bishops came to was that proselytising activities in the predominantly Catholic countries of Central and South America have hurt the moral and spiritual unity of the people of those nations and resulted in religious indifferentism among individuals.

The members of the hierarchy said that they were aware that the warnings they have voiced against the harm being done have been interpreted in the American and European press as "a bellicose and offensive attitude of defense". However, the bishops said, they have reached their conclusion regarding the evil of proselytism after basing themselves upon the "most recent documents, with a calm objectivity, in the light of the Gospel teachings and genuine apostolic traditions, guided by demands of Christian charity, and prompted solely by our sacred pastoral duties".

Another major problem discussed by those attending the conference was the serious shortage of priests among the Latin Americans. In Brazil, for example, it was pointed out that there was an average of one priest for 7,500 people. Besides the great means of prayer for more vocations, the Bishops also appealed to an intensification of Catholic Action among the laity as a way of stirring up interest in the high calling of the priesthood. *(NC)*

INDIA

Christians in India Total more than Eight Million

According to figures released in Nagpur by the National Christian Council, Indian Christians at the present time number 8,166,255 out of a total population of 361,934,581. The largest concentration of Christians is found in Travancore-Cochin in Malabar where there are 2,968,030 out of the total state population of 9,280,425.

Results of the survey contained in the *Christian Handbook of India* which is sponsored by the NCC, shows further that about 46 per cent of the nation's Christians are Roman Catholics, whose latest published membership in 1949 was given as 3,673,548. In that year non-Catholic Churches reported a membership of 4,374,847.

Other figures reveal that the largest non-Catholic bodies in India are the Orthodox Church of Malabar with 350,000 adherents and the Church of South India with 331,372. Additional denominations with a membership of over 100,000 are, in order: American Baptist Foreign Mission Society Churches, United Church of Northern India, Mar Thoma Syrian Church of Malabar, Methodist Church in Southern Asia, Andhra Evangelical Lutheran Church, (Anglican) Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, and the Gossner Evangelical Lutheran Church.

(EPS)

Extension of Native Rite Hierarchy in Southern India

A recent decision by the Holy See has extended the boundaries of the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy to include jurisdiction over territories covered by certain Latin Rite dioceses in South India. Catholics of the Syro-Malabar Rite, who number about one million, were organized under their own hierarchy in 1923.

Official notification of this decision was conveyed to Archbishop Augustine Kandathil of Ernakulam, the eighty-two-year-old Metropolitan of the Syro-Malabar Hierarchy. The communication was sent to the Archbishop on behalf of the Holy Father by Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Eastern Church, who visited Malabar in 1953.

The significance of the new ruling is that it gives the Syro-Malabar bishops spiritual jurisdiction over Catholics of their rite who live in the states of Travancore-Cochin, Madras, and Mysore.

In Bangalore, meanwhile, the corner stone for a new Syro-Malabar scholasticate was laid by His Excellency, Thomas Pothacamury, Archbishop of that city. With plans calling for its development into a full-fledged seminary, the scholasticate, when completed, is expected to give some 400 Syro-Malabar Carmelite priests to missionary endeavors in India.

Laying the corner stone, Archbishop Pothacamury expressed the hope that the prospective institution would open a new era in the history of the Church in India. *(NC)*

Two More Native Bishops for India

The consecration of Msgr. Peter Bernard Pereira as Auxiliary Bishop of Trivandrum brings to forty-four the number of native bishops in the sixty-six-member Indian hierarchy. Thirteen archbishops and bishops, 300 priests, and thousands of the laity took part in the consecration ceremonies of the new auxiliary to Belgian-born Bishop Vincent Dereere.

A few days earlier, another Indian priest, Msgr. Longinus Gabriel Pereira, was consecrated as auxiliary to His Eminence Valerian Cardinal Gracias, Archbishop of Bombay. *(Oss. Romano)*

* * *

PORTUGUESE WEST AFRICA

New Diocese Reveals Growth of Church

A fifty per cent increase in the number of Catholics in the past five years in the Diocese of Nova Lisboa has resulted in the establishment of the new diocese of Sa da Bandeira.

This is the second diocese to be established in Portuguese territory in Africa in the past year. The Diocese of Quelimane in Portuguese East Africa was erected last October.

The bishop of the Diocese of Sa da Bandeira is His Excellency, Altino Ribeiro Santana, who was formerly rector of the Goa Seminary. He will have under his jurisdiction 163,593 Catholics out of a total population of 701,241 in his territory. *(NC)*

BOOK REVIEWS

JEAN De SAUSSURE

1. *Crois-tu cela?* Geneva, Labor et Fides, 2nd Edition, 1948
2. *Contemplation de la Croix,* Neufchâtel, 1944
3. *Meditations pour la Semaine Sainte,* Neufchâtel, 1944

M. Jean de Saussure, a Calvinist minister, has published a good number of meditations on the life of Christ. We would like to comment briefly on three of these in which there would seem to be a progressive sympathy and understanding of those things which are of the essence of Catholic doctrine.

The first of these books, *Crois-tu cela?* is a defense and an explanation of the Apostles' Creed. The apology consists in demonstrating the intimate agreement of the Creed with Sacred Scripture and in refuting the objections of certain liberal Protestants. The explanation takes the form of exhortations (perhaps of sermons) directed to Calvinists. A profound religious sentiment animates these pages, the greater part of which would inspire any Christian. The reader is, as it were, constrained to penetrate into the depths of our Christian mysteries and to experience their power of sanctification. It is precisely here, however, that one meets with disappointment, for the author yields rather often to the temptation of rejecting one or the other Catholic doctrine: the merit of good works, the sacrifice of the Mass, created grace. Actually, what the author repudiates in these instances is not genuine Catholic teaching but the idea Protestants have formed of it. Oh, how useful would ecumenical discussion be on these very points!

The second work of M. Saussure contains a lengthy dialogue with Christ crucified. The mystery of the Redemption, the bodily and mental sufferings of the Saviour, the revelation thereby of the malice of sin, and of God's love and forgiveness—these are the essential themes contemplated here with an intense fervor which cannot leave the reader unmoved. *Contemplation de la Croix* was written for Protestants and indeed will impress them deeply with the fundamental Christian truths.

In his colloquy with Christ, the author almost always happily forgets to oppose himself to Catholic doctrine. In fact, he is in agreement with it, except for some exaggerated expression relating to the moral sufferings of the Saviour and to the miserable state of our nature; these expressions go even further than Jansenism, which is itself a mitigated form of Protestantism.

The third work, dealing with Holy Week, serves as a complement to M. Saussure's preceding book. It is made up, for the most part, of meditations on the events leading up to the Crucifixion: the driving of the money changers from the Temple, the anointing by Mary Magdalen,

and the Paschal supper. There are also reflections on the burial and the Resurrection of Christ.

This volume, which is dedicated to the "Frères de Taizé", makes just as much of an appeal as the previous study on the Redemption. It may perhaps even surpass it in so far as it is freer in form and has its material more orientated towards the attainment of spiritual joy. To my mind, it seems also to be closer to the Catholic spirit.

To be sure, there are oppositions that still remain. For example, we come across this sentence, which in one sense expresses a contradiction: "When Christ by His creative Word causes bread to become His Body, the bread does not cease to be bread . . ." What, then, we may ask, does this creative Word do?

Nevertheless, there are other sections in this latter work which possess a genuine Catholic ring. Speaking to Christ about the Holy Spirit, the author writes: "It is truly Thy life which He diffuses in me, Thy new life, Thy supernatural life . . . We are therefore not only pardoned, but even interiorly renewed; and if we remain sinners, it is no longer in the same sense as before".

These three volumes of M. Saussure show that Christians are drawn ever closer to each other as they grow in the knowledge and love of Christ.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

GEORGE TAVARD, A.A.: *A la rencontre du protestantisme.* Paris: Les Editions du Centurion, 1954.

Père Tavard, already highly esteemed for his fine work, *L'Angoisse de l'Unité,* and for his well-informed reports appearing in the French Catholic daily, *La Croix,* has produced another well-written volume which does honor to the new series of which it forms part. (1) This work marks the first-fruits of his many direct contacts with the Protestant world and his studies on the whole problem of Protestantism.

If our purpose is to create a climate favorable to unity, Catholics —we are not concerned for the moment with our separated brethren— must really understand Protestantism and shake themselves free once and for all from all those prejudices, little and great, to which we readily have given acceptance. To set out to cross the frontiers of the Protestant mind demands clear thinking and perfect sincerity on our part. Without this it is impossible to comprehend, not just the more speculative problems of schism, but those depths of religious experience which alone can explain (without however justifying them) the attitudes adopted by Protestantism vis-a-vis Catholic doctrine.

Doubtless, one can know well only that which he has himself experienced. Therefore, the Protestant finds it difficult to enter the

(1) *Le poids du jour,* Les Editions du Centurion, rue Bayard, Paris VIII.

Catholic mind, and vice versa. The Catholic theologian, when he applies himself to the problem of Protestantism, finds that he is arriving only at its extérior; and he cannot, under any pretext of sympathy and understanding, minimize the full import of Catholic principles. Indeed, the approach to the Protestant mind is both delicate and arduous, but it is not impossible. If it is a fact that there do exist in Protestantism certain religious experiences the authenticity of which one may not question a priori, then it is within the power of a Catholic to understand them and to see in them the inherent dangers which have given rise to past and present dissensions. In any case, religious experiences are the point of contact between the well-informed Catholic and the sincere Protestant. It is here that one meets the strongest and most determined opposition, but at the same time the strategic points of departure. Any kind of ecumenism must needs be an essentially religious thing. We are not setting out to rebuild the spiritual unity of Europe or to promote the brotherhood of nations: it is the City of God, the Kingdom, that must be the sole purpose of our endeavours. The rest is extra gain.

At the very beginnings of Protestantism we meet with strong religious personalities—Luther, unshakably convinced of justification by faith alone; Calvin, still more radical in his evangelism and totally taken up with the 'hidden power of the spirit'. Under the stress of these concepts, both of them were led to reject the Catholic Church.

Today Protestantism is a bewildering complexity. It is not therefore surprising that Protestants who cannot forget Christ's prayer 'that they may be one' feel troubled when they are confronted with the ecumenical endeavours of which Père Tavard gives a rapid historical survey. However, in spite of this complexity, there exists a certain singleness of purpose that binds together all Christian communities, whether they be radical or conservative in spirit. The presence of Christ, the Word of the Father, in Holy Scripture is a dogma basic to all. Viewed under this aspect, anything added by man, even if he is a believer, to the content of Scripture, savours of blasphemy. No natural morality exists, for man has a sinful nature. Neither is there a revealed moral law, for Revelation supersedes law; what now obtains is 'the gift of salvation in Christ'. Protestant morals are the personal discovery of that which is just in the sight of God. The true Church is something known to God and has its being in the mysterious union of Christians in God. The Churches here on earth, fully aware of their differences, seek to overcome them by a more perfect adherence to the word of God. But God alone can put an end to these differences at the moment He judges expedient. In Père Tavard's opinion, it is here that we find the deepest streams of modern Protestant thought.

The attitude of Catholics towards Protestantism obeys a dialectic that the author of this work does not perhaps make very clear. The older generation, who are rather severely criticized, merit as much

sympathy as the Protestants themselves. They resorted to a defence as bitter as the attack and made use of measures which they thought most effective in the face of Protestant proselytism. Today the heat of religious controvery has cooled, but the differences are more marked than ever. The resurgence of Biblical and patristic studies, the renewal of liturgical interest and pastoral methods, urges the Catholic theologian, at grips with the problem of Protestantism, to reconsider his ideas while remaining within the general framework of Tradition.

The Church has never ceased to be mindful of these children who have been separated from her fold. But in our days, now that we are confronted with Protestant ecumenism, we are beginning to conceive the main lines of Catholic ecumenism more clearly, especially in the light of papal pronouncements. It becomes all the more necessary, therefore, to fully understand the instructions that have been given to Catholics in this matter. Père Tavard subjects them to a relevant analysis and points to exaggerations and obvious misinterpretations. Over against the imprudent haste of yesterday's ecumenists, there is counterposed the prudence of today. The day of unity, like the day of judgment, no longer appears to us as being near at hand. However, this does not excuse us from preparing for it with unflagging zeal. This anxious search for unity should give rise to constructive initiatives and fervent prayer.

But is it prudence or a return to the rashness of the past to speak from time to time of the *vestigia Ecclesiae,* of those 'elements of the Church' which our separated brethren more or less seek to exploit? Or of an 'immanence of the Church' within Protestantism? In so far as it is a separatist movement, Protestantism forms no part of the Church, though it does not thereby follow that our separated brethren are themselves without the Spirit 'who fills the whole earth'. But if they are visited by the Spirit, they do not necessarily dwell in the Spirit. The Holy Spirit has been given to the Church alone; He dwells solely in her. This indeed is the root evil of any separation—it cuts off men from the abiding help of the Holy Spirit, the privilege of the one. true Church.

A la rencontre du protestantisme is a book that makes for reflection. It is an excellent introduction to the question of Catholic ecumenism, and the work of a young master already sure of his methods of approach. May it serve to stir up apostles in both number and zeal for the cause of unity which is such a precious one for us all.

A. SAGE, A.A.